



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



Per. 971 e.  $\frac{130}{48.6}$













THE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
SACRED LITERATURE  
AND  
BIBLICAL RECORD.

EDITED BY  
B. HARRIS COWPER,

EDITOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN GREEK FROM CODEX A; A SYRIAC GRAMMAR, ETC.

---

VOL. VI. (NEW SERIES.)

---



WILLIAMS AND NORGATE,  
14 HENRIETTA STREET, COVENT GARDEN, LONDON;  
20 SOUTH FREDERICK STREET, EDINBURGH.

1865.

LONDON :  
MITCHELL AND HUGHES, PRINTERS,  
WARDOUR STREET, W.

# INDEX

TO

## VOLUME VI. (NEW SERIES).

### A

Abydos, the tablet of, 5.  
Acts of the Apostles, commentary on, 476.  
Acts xvii. 23, "Devotions" in, 469.  
Acts ii. 42, exposition of, 468.  
Adam of St. Victor, a hymn of, 49.  
Adoption, the, 244.  
Alexander, the death of, 408.  
Alford, Dean, referred to, 137; on the erroneous passages of the Authorized Version of the Bible, 324; and the infidel, 324; quoted, 350.  
Algazel, 365.  
Alphabet, the, of Bardesanes, 465.  
Angels, the sin of the, 182.  
Anglo-Saxon, the Lord's Prayer in, 457.  
Apocalypse of the Old Testament and that of the New, analogy between, 76; the analogy of the, 462.  
Apocalypse, Eusebius quoted on, 76; of Daniel and that of St. John compared, 78.  
Aquinas, Thomas, quoted.  
Arabs, metaphysical schools amongst the, 354; the most celebrated philosophers amongst, 360.  
Archons, the, of Demosthenes, 149.  
Arnald, M., quoted on Inspiration, 291.  
Arnold, Prize Essay, 482.  
Arnold, Dr., quoted, 349, 352.  
Art, early Christian, 503.  
Augustine quoted, 70.  
Authors, extracts from various, on Inspiration, 261.

### B

Bardesanes, the alphabet of, 465; Hilgenfeld on, 493.  
Barkal, the stelé discovered at, 15.  
Basil, St., quoted on Inspiration, 291.  
Beattie, Dr., quoted on Inspiration, 279.  
Bedell, Bishop, memoir of, 249.  
Beer, Dr., referred to, 355.  
Bergier, Abbé, quoted on Inspiration, 271.  
Berosus, the Chaldaean historian quoted, 14, *note*; referred to, 104.  
Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis, 225.  
Bible, the, Chillingworth on, 50; Cranmer's extracts from, 302; Geneva, extracts from, 302; Parker's extracts from, 302; English, the, 480.  
Bible, the Holy, with notes, etc., 479.  
Bible and science, the claims of the, 245.  
Biblical Papers, 481.  
Birch, Dr., an inscription deciphered by, 12; quoted, 24.  
Blanc, Louis le, quoted on Inspiration, 275.  
Bonaventura quoted, 30, *note*; a hymn of, 49.  
Brandis referred to, 98.  
Brugsch, Dr., quoted, 4, 17.  
Bull, Bishop, referred to, 141.  
Bunsen, Baron, quoted, 5, 7, 19, 112.  
Burgess, Dr., referred to, 129, *note*.

### C

Cajetan, Cardinal, quoted on Inspiration, 288.

Calâm, the science of the, 358.  
 Calderon quoted, 36, 40, 46.  
 Calippic period, the, 402.  
 Calvin, John, 248; quoted on Inspiration, 262.  
 Catalogue of Syriac MSS. in the Bodleian, 481.  
 Cerameus quoted, 38.  
 Chaldea, ethnography of early, 171.  
 Champollion quoted, 4.  
 Charnock, Stephen, the complete works of, 234, 490.  
 Cherubim, Riehm on, 492.  
 Chillingworth on the Bible, 50.  
 China, history of, quoted, 13; M. Meadows quoted on, 196.  
 Chinese, the philosophy of the, 196.  
 Christ, the, of the Gospels, 244.  
 Christian art, early, 503.  
 Christian and Jewish inscriptions, 497.  
 Christianity, meditations on the essence of, 487.  
 Chronograms, ancient Biblical, 496.  
 Chronology, a rational view of Hebrew, 107; Egyptian, 109; Stuart Poole quoted on, 110.  
 Church of England, extension of the ministry in the, 493.  
 Churchman, *Literary*, quoted, 320; Pringle quoted on, 343.  
 Church, the early Scottish, 477.  
 Cifaites, the, 356.  
 Clare, John, a book which belonged to, 469.  
 Comestor, Petrus, quoted, 41.  
 Commentary on the Acts, 476; on the Old Testament, 476; on Epistle to the Colossians, 478.  
 Common sense, English, 494.  
 Contenson, Vincent, quoted on Inspiration, 290.  
 Conybeare referred to, 353.  
 Cross, the, as the Tree of Life, 47.  
 Cuneiform inscriptions, the decipherment of, described and tested, 91.  
 Cureton, Dr., referred to, 129, *note*.  
 Cycle, the Metonic, and Calippic period, 402.

## D

Damascus, Johannes, quoted, 37.  
 Daniel, proposal for publishing a new exposition, 256; the Prophet, 472; authenticity of the Book of, 473; Sir Isaac Newton quoted on, 473.  
 Danish-Saxon, the Lord's Prayer in, 457.  
 Dante quoted, 507.

Darwin referred to, 321.  
 Dashoor, the great Pyramid of, 9.  
 Demosthenes, the archons of, 149.  
 De Pressensé, works by, 206, 491.  
 Desmond, the Countess of, 20.  
 "Devotions" in Acts xvii. 23, 469.  
*Dictionary*, Smith's *Biblical*, quoted, 110—113, *note*, 121, 122, 125.  
 Discussions on the Gospels, 470.  
*Djabarites*, the, 355.  
 Doddridge, Dr., quoted on New Testament, 128; quoted on Inspiration, 268.  
 Donaldson, Dr., quoted, 350, 351.  
 Douay theologians quoted on Inspiration, 288.  
*Dyalogue, Proper*, 310.

## E

Eber and the children of Eber, 179.  
*Edinburgh Review* quoted, 365.  
 Edessa, James of, 357.  
 Edmund of Canterbury quoted, 30, *note*.  
 Egypt, Israel in, 1.  
 Egyptian dynasties of Manetho, 191.  
 Elephantine, the engraved stone at, 5.  
 Ellicott, Bishop, quoted, 68.  
 "E," the preposition, 183.  
 English, the Dean's, 484.  
 English, the Lord's Prayer in, 457.  
 English writers, 242.  
 Enoch, Book of, quoted, 84, *note*.  
 Epiphanius quoted, 28.  
 Ess, Van, referred to, 297.  
 Ethnography of Early Chaldea, 171.  
 Eucharist, the witness of the, 483.  
 Euripides quoted, 349.  
 Eusebius quoted, 114.  
 Evangelical Calendar, Piper's, 494.  
*Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*, 242.  
*Evangile, Le Pays de l'*, 491.  
 Exposition of Acts ii. 42, 468.

## F

Faith and Life, 493.  
 Faussett, Professor, quoted, 117.  
 Faustus Socinus, quoted on Inspiration, 293.  
 Ferdinand of Escalante, quoted on Inspiration, 288.  
 Fergusson quoted, 95.  
 Fishes in the Sea of Galilee, 468.  
 Forster, the Rev. Charles, 8.

Fortunatus quoted, 39; a hymn of, 49.  
 Frassen quoted on Inspiration, 289.  
 Frauenlob quoted, 43, 44.  
 Frederick II. encouraging the Jews, 360.  
 Fredigius quoted on Inspiration, 292.  
 French Revolution, De Pressensé on, 206.  
 Fresnel referred to, 103.  
 Fry, Mr., his facsimiles of Tyndale's Translation, etc., 295; quoted, 298.

G

Galilee, fishes in the sea of, 468.  
 Gausson, referred to, 294.  
 Geiger's *Judenthum*, 491.  
 Genesis iv. 8, 464; vi. 3, 467.  
 Gennadius, confession of, 492.  
 Gervasius of Tilbury quoted, 42.  
 Glass, early Christian, 253.  
 Godfridus of Viterbo quoted, 43.  
 Göthe quoted, 36.  
 Gospels, discussions on the, 470.  
 Gratry's philosophy reviewed, 209.  
 Gregory of Nyssa quoted, 28.  
 Grey, Lady Jane, letter to her sister, 106.  
 Guizot's *Meditations*, 240, 487.

H

Haldane, Robert, quoted, 188; referred to, 294.  
 Hales, Dr., referred to, 117; quoted, 119.  
 Hall, Robert, quoted, 313.  
 Hammond, Dr., quoted on Inspiration, 263.  
 Heeren quoted, 22.  
 Heidenheim's *Vierteljahrsschrift*, 247.  
 Hengstenberg quoted, 9, *note*.  
 Henry, Matthew, quoted, 187.  
 Henry of Meissen quoted, 43.  
 Herzog's *Real Encyclopädie*, 492.  
 Hincks, Dr., referred to, 91, *note*; 97, and *note*; quoted, 149; quoted, 402, 403, 406, 407.  
 History, questions upon Scripture, 245.  
 Holiness, God's way of, 247.  
 Home in humble life, 490.  
 Homes, our eternal, 494.  
 Hooker, Richard, quoted on Inspiration, 262.  
 Household Prayer, 492.  
 Howe quoted, 401.  
 Howson referred to, 353.

Hugo of St. Victor quoted, 6, 29.  
 Hymnal, the daily service, 241.  
 Hymns, ancient, 49.

I

Ibn-Bâdja, 366; the writings of, 366.  
 Ibn-Roschd, 369, 371.  
 Ibn-Sinâ's works, account of, 363; Philosophy of, 364.  
 Ibn-Tofail, 367.  
 Immesen, Arnold, quoted, 46.  
*Inferno* quoted, 361.  
 Infidelity, popular, in the Metropolis, 320.  
 Inscriptions in the British Museum, 19; the decipherment of cuneiform, described and tested, 91; Christian and Jewish, 497.  
 Inspiration, the nature and extent of Divine, 257; extracts from various authors on, 261; Calvin quoted on, 262; Richard Hooker quoted in, 262; Wolfgang Musculus quoted on, 262; Dr. Hammond quoted on, 263; Benedict, Pictet, quoted on, 263; Francis Turretin quoted on, 268; Dr. Doddridge quoted on, 268; different kinds of, 269; Abbé Bergier quoted on, 271; Richard Simon, 274, 286; Louis le Blanc quoted on, 275; Nichols, Dr., quoted on, 276; Beattie, Dr., quoted on, 279; Scott, Thomas, quoted on, 281; Tomline, Bishop, quoted on, 282; Jesuits of Louvain quoted on, 287; Douey theologians quoted on, 288; Ferdinand of Escalante quoted on, 288; Cardinal Cajetan quoted on, 288; Frassen's *Disquisitiones Biblicæ* quoted on, 289; the Jesuit Mariana quoted on, 289; Melchior Cano quoted on, 290; Vincent Contenson quoted on, 290; Cardinal Bellarmine quoted on, 290; M. Arnauld quoted on, 291; St. Basil quoted on, 291; Fredigius quoted on, 292; Faustus Socinus quoted on, 293; Sir Norton Knatchbull quoted on, 293; Haldane referred to on, 294; Simon Episcopus quoted on, 294.  
 Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, the, 482.  
 Instruction, a brief in the worship of God, etc., 469.  
 Interpretation of Scripture, the, 68.



Irenæus quoted, 38.  
*Ischrâkyin*, the, 359.  
 Isaiah, the fifty-third chapter of, 246.  
 Israel in Egypt, 1.

## J

Jacobus à Voragine quoted, 42.  
 James of Edessa, 357.  
 Jerusalem, the holy places of, 241.  
 Jerusalem, the taking of by Shishak, 10; Mr. Wilson quoted on, 10.  
 Jesuits of Lovaine, the, quoted on Inspiration, 287.  
 Jewish and Christian Inscriptions, Job, the book of, 238.  
 Josephus quoted, 8.  
 Jowett, Professor, quoted, 350.  
 Judenthum das, und seine Geschichte, 491.  
 Julien, M. Stanislaus, his translations from the Chinese, 196.

## K

Kadrites, the, 355.  
 Kaye University Prize, 473.  
 Knatchbull, Sir Norton, quoted on Inspiration, 293.

## L

Lamentations iv. 20 in the Latin Vulgate, 181.  
 Language, lectures on the science of, 242.  
 Lao Tseu, 196.  
 Layard, A. H., referred to, 96; quoted, 98.  
 Lepsius, Professor, quoted, 4.  
 Lewis, Sir G. C., referred to, 102.  
 Liguori's Doctrine of Equivocation, 495.  
 Literature, Royal Society of, 495.  
 Longevity, modern instances of, 20.  
 Lord's, our, life on earth, 491.  
 Lyell, Sir C., referred to, 321.  
 Lyra Messianica, 240.  
 Lyra Mystica, 485.

## M

Macarius, Chrysocephalus, 'quoted, 28.  
 Magee, Dean, referred to, 137.  
 Man, his true nature, etc., 493.

Manetho, Bunsen's admiration of, 7; quoted, 16; quoted by Josephus, 22, 24; Egyptian dynasties of, 191.  
 Marbles, the Arundellian, quoted, 23.  
 Mariana, the Jesuit, quoted on Inspiration, 289.  
 Marsh, Bishop, quoted, 119, 123.  
 Martyr, Justin, quoted, 27; referred to, 27.  
 Martyrs, the encomium of the, 129.  
 Mary, the departure of my Lady from this world, 417.  
 Maternus quoted, 37; and *note*.  
 Matthew, St., the first twelve chapters of the Gospel according to, 225.  
 Maxims, harmonic, of science and religion, 483.  
*Méditations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétienne*, 240.  
 Meditations on the essence of Christianity, 487.  
 Meditations, eucharistic, 246.  
 Meditations and prayers, 493.  
 Melchior Cano quoted on Inspiration, 290.  
 Men, the presumption of, 416.  
 Ménant referred to, 96.  
 Metonic cycle, the, 402.  
 Mercy, the legend of the oil of, 30.  
 Milton quoted, 508.  
 Mordtmann referred to, 92.  
 More, Sir Thomas, quoted, 306, 307.  
 Munk, M., referred to, 355; quoted, 363.  
 Münster quoted, 41, *note*.  
 Musculus, Wolfgang, quoted on Inspiration, 262.

## N

Nablus, a residence in, 485.  
 Name, the memorial, 455.  
 Netherlandish literature, quotations from, 32—35.  
 Newton, Sir Isaac, quoted on Daniel, 473.  
 Newman, Dr., referred to, 323.  
 Nichols, William, quoted on Inspiration, 276.  
 Nicodemus, the Gospel of, quoted, 38.  
 Norris, referred to, 92; quoted, 101, *note*.

## O

Oppert quoted, 99, and *note*.  
 Origen quoted, 121.

P

Pædobaptism, an apology for, 249.  
 Palfreyman, Thomas, extract from, 26.  
 Papyrus in British Museum quoted, 17.  
 Parable of the rich man and Lazarus, the, 51, 59, 62.  
 Pastoral work, principles and practice of, 478.  
 Paul, revelation of the Apostle, 372; the Epistles of St., 495.  
 Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, 489.  
 Perowne, Mr., quoted, 213, 216, 217.  
 Philippians, lectures upon the Epistle to, 478.  
 Pictet, Benedict, quoted on Inspiration, 263.  
 Pierotti, Dr., 241.  
 Plato quoted, 7.  
 Pliny quoted, 81, *note*.  
 Plutarch quoted, 151.  
 Poole's *Horæ Egyptiacæ* referred to, 9.  
 Poole, Mr. Stuart, quoted, 110, 112, 125.  
 Prayer Book, lectures on the, 245.  
 Prayer, household, 493.  
 Prayer, the Lord's, Versions of, 457.  
 Prayers, meditations and, 493.  
 Prison, the Spirits in, 449.  
 Prize, the children's, 490.  
 Promise, the word of, 490.  
 Psalms, the Book of, 213; Mr. Perowne quoted on, 213, 216, 217.  
 Punishment, capital, and Gen. ix. 6, 314.  
 Purity, the brothers of, 359.  
 Pusey, Dr., quoted on Daniel, 462.

Q

Quarterlies, sundry, 249.

R

Raffles quoted.  
 Rationalism, German, 477.  
 Rawlinson quoted, 25; *Aids to Faith*, quoted, 113.  
 Rawlinson, Sir Henry, referred to, 95; quoted, 100, 103, and *note*.  
 Realists and Nominalists, the quarrel of, 361.  
 Renan quoted, 87, *note*; referred to, 321.

Revelation, the, of the Apostle Paul, 372.  
 Revelation, the divine plan of, 231.  
 Robertson, Rev. F. W., referred to, 144.  
 Romanism, the novelties of, 243.  
 Romans viii. 17, 18, note on, 177, 453.  
 Rome, St. Paul's Epistle to the Christians in, 233.  
 Rosetta stone, the, 2.  
 Rougé, Vicomte de, referred to, 5; quoted, 6.

S

Samaritans, an account of the modern, 485.  
 Sanskrit language, a Grammar of the, 236.  
 Schools, metaphysical amongst the Arabs, 354.  
 Scotch, the Lord's Prayer in, 457.  
 Scott, Thomas, quoted, 187; quoted on Inspiration, 281.  
 Scottish Church, the early, 477.  
 Scribe, the, instructed, etc., 495.  
 Scripture, gleanings from, 494.  
 Scripture and its interpretation, Ellicott quoted on, 68.  
 Scripture and science, 495.  
 Selden, John, quoted, 136.  
 Selections from the Syriac, 129.  
 Sermons, Dr. Mac Neece's University, 134.  
 Sibbes, Richard, the complete works of, 234.  
 Simon Episcopius quoted on Inspiration, 294.  
 Simon, Richard, quoted on Inspiration, 274, 286.  
 Sincerity, the brothers of, 359.  
 Society, report of the Royal Asiatic, quoted, 104.  
 Soul, the loss of the, 313; the sublime contemplations of a holy, 401.  
*Souteck*, meaning of the name, 17.  
 Spirit and soul, notes on, 495.  
 Stephen, Sir James, quoted, 471.  
 Strauss referred to, 321.  
 Syncellus quoted, 14.  
 Syntax and synonyms of the Greek Testament, 219.  
 Syriac MSS., catalogue of, in the Bodleian Library, 481.  
 Syriac, selections from the, 129.  
 Syrus, Ephræm, quoted, 119, 121.

## T

Tertullian quoted, 39, 81, *note*.  
 Testament, commentary on the Old and New, 246; Biblical commentary on the Old, 476.  
 Testament, Scholia on passages of the Old, 475.  
 Testament, syntax and synonyms of the Greek, 219; texts of MSS. of the Greek, 228.  
 Testament, Tyndale's translation of the New, 295, 304.  
 Texts, Exegesis of difficult, Matt. xvi. 50, 344; Matt. xxvii. 42; Mark xv. 81, 344; Mark vi. 7, 345; Acts ii. 1, 345; Acts iv. 13, 347; Acts iv. 26, 29, 30, 348; Acts v. 3, 348; Acts vii. 53, 349; Rom. ii. 27, 350; 2 Cor. iv. 15, 351; 1 Thess. iv. 4, 352.  
 Texts of the most ancient MSS. of the Greek Testament, 228.  
 Theodulf quoted, 39.  
 Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, quoted, 11.  
 Tholuck on Rationalism, 492.  
 Thucydides quoted, 352.  
 Tomline, Bishop, quoted on Inspiration, 282.  
 Toulouse, the Council of, prohibits the Scriptures to the Laity, 296.  
 Tree of knowledge, on the derivation of the wood of the cross from, 41.  
 Tree of life, the, 27; application of, to the person of Christ, 27; Justin Martyr, opinion of, 27; Macarius Chrysocephelus quoted on, 28; Epiphanius quoted on, 28; Gregory of Nyssa quoted on, 28; Hugo of St. Victor quoted on, 29; application of the, to the cross of Christ, 36; Johannes Damascenus quoted on, 37; Maternus quoted on, 37, and

*note*, 89; Thomas Aquinas quoted, 38; Theophanes Cerameus quoted on, 38; Irenæus quoted on, 38; Nicodemus, the gospel of, quoted, 38; the cross as the, 47.  
 Trypho quoted, 121.  
 Turretin, Francis, quoted on Inspiration, 268.  
 Tyndale's translations, 295; an account of, 298; specimens of, 301, 404, 307; Sir Thomas More and, 306, 307.

## U

Ueberweg's patristic philosophy, 492.  
 Unbelief, causes of, 321; Vaughan referred to, 353.

## V

Victorinus, a hymn of, 49.  
 Vulgate, Lamentations iv. 20 in the Latin, 181.

## W

Walton, Bishop, referred to, 117.  
*Westminster Review* quoted, 76.  
 Whately, Archbishop, referred to, 136.  
 Wilkinson, Sir Gardiner, 23; quoted, 25.  
 Williams, Dr. Rowland, quoted, 12.  
 Wilson's, Mr., *Essay on the National Church* quoted, 10.  
 Wilson, Professor H. H., quoted, 105.  
 Wordsworth, Dr., quoted, 352, 480.

## Y

Young, Dr. Thomas, 3.

THE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
SACRED LITERATURE  
AND  
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XI.—OCTOBER, 1864.  
~~~~~

ISRAEL IN EGYPT.

Few of the millions in the habit of making holiday at Sydenham are probably aware that an inscription in the language of the ancient Egyptians circumscribes one of the most beautiful courts of the Crystal Palace, and tells those who are capable of deciphering hieroglyphic mysteries the age and the object of all to be seen around.

The translation of the inscription in question reads as follows :—

“ In the seventeenth year of the reign of Her Majesty, the ruler of the waves, the royal daughter Victoria, Lady most Gracious, the architects, sculptors, and painters erected this palace and gardens with one thousand columns, one thousand decorations, one thousand statues of chief men and women, one thousand trees, one thousand flowers, one thousand birds and beasts, one thousand fountains, and one thousand vases. The architects, painters, and sculptors built this palace as a book for the instruction of all countries, regions, and districts. May it ever prosper.”

The wanderer in the East may also read an inscription in the same ancient language, of nearly the same date, in a locality where, if there be less of the combined beauty of nature and of art than exists at Sydenham, we should more naturally expect to light upon an historical record in characters which disclose

their origin, but whose decipherment, for nearly two thousand years, has been lost to the civilized world. On a large and carefully prepared stone slab, at some height above the entrance to the great pyramid (built by king Cheops, as Herodotus calls him, or Suphis, according to the present mode of hieroglyphic reading, as a resting-place for his mummy), is the inscription referred to above. It may be thus translated :—

“ Thus speaks the servants of the king, whose name is the Sun and Rock of Prussia, Lepsius the scribe, Erbkam the architect, the brothers Weidenback the painters, Frey the painter, Franke the farmer, Bonomi the sculptor, Wild the architect :—Hail to the Eagle, Shelterer of the Cross, the King, the Sun and Rock of Prussia, the Son of the Sun, Freer of the Land, Frederick William the Fourth, the Philopator, his country's Father the Gracious, the Favourite of Wisdom and History, the Guardian of the Rhine stream, chosen by Germany, the Giver of Life. May the Highest God grant the King and his Consort, the Queen Elizabeth, the Life-rich one, the Philometer, her country's Mother the Gracious, a fresh-springing life on earth, and a blessed habitation in heaven for ever. In the year of our Saviour, 1842, in the tenth month, and the fifteenth day of the month, on the forty-seventh birthday of His Majesty, on the Pyramid of King Suphis; in the third year, the fifth month, the ninth day of the reign of His Majesty, in the year 3164, from the commencement of the Dog-star period under King Manepthes.”

Without stopping to criticize these contemporary inscriptions, which may be safely left to the *savant* from New Zealand of a future age, they are merely introduced as significant of the progress which the study of hieroglyphics has made amongst the literati of the present day. The key which has opened the literary treasures of the ancient Egyptians to the scientific world is unquestionably the famous Rosetta stone which now adorns the British Museum. In the year 1799, a French artillery officer, named Bouchart, while engaged on some works at the fortress of Rosetta, in Lower Egypt, discovered the fragment of an oblong square slab of black basalt from the “far Syene.” It bore a trilingual inscription: the upper one was in hieroglyphics, the lower in Greek, while the centre was in a character commonly known as the enchorial or demotic, *i. e.*, the writing of the people as distinct from that of the priests. The Greek text shewed that the tablet contained a recognition of the highest honours of the Pharaohs in the person of Ptolemy Epiphanes, who reigned in Egypt at the close of the second century B.C. Sir Ralph Abercrombie's victory at Alexandria, and the subse-

quent surrender of the city, placed it in the hands of a distinguished scholar, Mr. W. R. Hamilton, author of the *Ægyptiaca*, then with the British army as the government commissioner. The monument was dispatched to England, and, thus, by a fatality no less singular than striking, became permanently located in the British capital in place of adorning the Louvre, at Paris. As engraved copies of the Rosetta stone became common in Europe, its decipherment appeared to philosophers a problem capable of being solved. Heyne and Porson, by restoring and interpreting the Greek inscription, greatly facilitated this most difficult task. To an Englishman belongs the honour of having taken the first step towards reading the hieroglyphic portion of the tablet. Dr. Thomas Young, a learned physician, who was known to fame by his discoveries in mathematical and physical science, had his attention directed to the great Egyptian problem of the day, and so rapid was his progress that in less than a year after the commencement of such studies he was enabled to offer "A Conjectural Translation of the Egyptian Inscription of the Rosetta stone." The system which Dr. Young originated has been more or less confirmed by the genius of such men as Champollion, De Rougé, and Marriette, amongst the French; Bunsen, Lepsius, and Brugsch, amongst the Germans; and of our own countrymen, the not less distinguished names of Birch, Wilkinson, Osburn, Poole, Goodwyn, Sharpe, and others, who have all contributed their quota to the greatest philological triumph of the present century.

It is said that one who claims rank as a philologist remains still unconvinced. The Rev. Charles Forster, author of a work entitled *The One Primeval Language*, in which he has endeavoured to prove that the inscriptions on the rocks of Sinai were engraved by the Israelites during their wanderings in the wilderness, has contended that he alone possesses the true key to unlock the hieroglyphic mysteries of ancient Egypt. There is, however, a story on record which makes us hesitate before bowing in submission to the conclusions of one who, probably, stands almost, if not quite, alone, in the peculiarity of his views. When a work upon the Egyptian inscriptions in the British Museum was published not long ago by Dr. Birch, one of the most distinguished Egyptologists, Mr. Forster gladly seized the occasion, though rather too hastily, as it proved for his own fame, to shew the superiority of his system of interpretation. Selecting the hieroglyphic inscription, which appeared in the frontispiece, as the test of his skill, he confidently announced that it referred to some historic deed which happened in the reign of Thothmes III., the grandfather of the Pharaoh supposed

to have been drowned in the Red Sea. However, the event proved that so far from being of so very high antiquity, the inscription had been composed by Dr. Birch himself in the British Museum, and was, in reality, a dedication of the work to our Sovereign Lady Queen Victoria.

The system of hieroglyphic interpretation has now stood the test of half a century, and not only has it received the adhesion, as well as exercised the utmost skill, of some of the acutest intellects of the day, but it has also confirmed in no slight degree the truth of Israel's history in Egypt, which must, therefore, commend itself to every believer in the authenticity of the earlier books of Scripture. Unhappily, some of the present Egyptologists have either denied or perverted this evidence in disregard of the expressed opinion of the most famous of them all. Alluding to the adversaries of revelation in his own time, Champollion wrote: "They will find in this work an absolute reply to their calumnies, since I have demonstrated that no Egyptian monument is really older than the year 2200 before our era. This, certainly, is a very high antiquity, but it presents nothing contradictory to the sacred histories, and I venture to affirm that it establishes them on all points; for it is, in fact, by adopting the chronology and the succession of kings given by the Egyptian monuments that the Egyptian history wonderfully accords with the sacred writings."

German neologians and British essayists, aided now by episcopal authority, have endeavoured to throw discredit upon the story of the Exodus, as recorded in Scripture. Be it ours to shew, from the evidence which has recently been brought to light by Egyptology, what strong confirmation this science in reality affords to the truth of the Mosaic record. And we may console ourselves with this reflection, that the extraordinary differences which exist between those who exalt human reason above Scripture necessarily lessen the force of those objections which their undoubted talent and power of criticism would otherwise command. While, for example, we gather from the Book of Exodus that the duration of the Israelites in Egypt, from the time of the descent of Jacob and the Patriarchs unto the day of their deliverance by Moses, amounted exactly to 215 years, three distinguished German writers not only refuse to pay the slightest regard to the Mosaic account, but disagree so much with each other that it is impossible to accept them as guides on the dispute in question. Professor Lepsius states that "only about ninety years intervened from the entrance of Jacob to the Exodus of Moses;" Dr. Brugsch contends that the Israelites were in Egypt during the complete period of 430 years; while

Baron Bunsen writes, "the duration of the sojourn in Egypt was 1434 years."<sup>a</sup>

In a similar manner, Egyptologists who refuse to make Scripture the basis of their calculations, differ respecting the duration of the rule of the shepherd kings in Egypt. Notwithstanding the existence of the Tablet of Aydos, one of the chief treasures of the British Museum, which Bunsen justly terms "the most celebrated of all chronological monuments," as it gives us a clue to determine the duration of the Hycsos invasion, the learned Baron computes it as lasting 926 years; Professor Lepsius reduces it to 500 years; while the Vicomte de Rougé elongates it to 2017 years. The true limit, as we believe, not exceeding above 100 years, *i. e.*, during the reign of two kings whose names are inscribed on the tablet; and which computation alone harmonizes with the requirements of the story of the Exodus, as recorded in the Pentateuch. Nothing, indeed, can prove more clearly the fallacious mode of reasoning adopted by some Egyptologists than this attempt to lengthen the continuance of a foreign dynasty in Egypt for so many centuries beyond what Scripture, the monuments, and historical experience appear to warrant. As in the case of the Norman conquest of this country, the Hycsos would have ceased to have been considered foreigners had their dynasty lasted through two or, at the utmost, three centuries. The impossibility of De Rougé's theory may be estimated by supposing that the descendants of Julius Cæsar had been ruling in England ever since the first Roman invasion, and that the present generation of Englishmen, headed by a descendant of the ancient British kings, were to rise against them, and expel them from the throne *in consequence of their being foreigners*.

We may mention another instance of the great difference existing amongst Egyptologists, who prefer their own speculations to the harmony which, we shall endeavour to shew, exists between Scripture and Egyptian history, as recorded on the monuments, and related by Manetho in his dynastic lists of the Pharaohs. Built into the river wall, past which the Nile flows at Elephantine, is a block of stone engraved with hieroglyphical characters, proving it to have once formed a part of one of those ancient almanacks which are to be seen at Medinet-Abou, Tentyra, and Esneh. It bears a date which is still legible, and which reads as follows: "28th day of the month Epiphi. Festival of the Rising of the Dog Star." A dispute has been raging amongst Egyptologists as to the name of the Pharaoh who

<sup>a</sup> Lepsius' *Letters from Egypt*, p. 475. Dr. Brugsch's *Histoire d'Égypte*, p. 80. Bunsen's *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, iii., 357.



erected this monument, for it has been fairly assumed that if we knew this for certain, and likewise (which is another most important element) whether the Egyptians had a standard latitude on which all their astronomical calculations were based, just as we possess a standard meridian at Greenwich, we might find a fixed point in chronology for the reign of a certain Pharaoh, and rectify the dynasties of Manetho accordingly. Assuming that Memphis, Egypt's ancient capital, was the standard latitude, and knowing that the 28th of the month Epiphi answers to the 20th of July, it has been calculated that the Dog-star rose heliacally at Memphis on that day only during one of these four years, viz., B.C. 1477—1474, during which the festival was observed, as recorded in the calendar. In the neighbourhood of the quay, at Elephantine, where this old almshouse now stands as part of a new wall, according to the custom of the degenerate Egyptians of modern days, the escutcheons of Thothmes III., and Rameses II., both of whom bear, and, perhaps, deserve, the title of "The Great," have been discovered on other hieroglyphically engraved *débris* of ruined palaces and temples hard by. Dr. Birch considers that the calendar belongs to the time of Thothmes III.; Viscount de Rougé, to Rameses II. In a paper read by the former before the Archæological Society some years ago, he cautiously observed, "If this fragment is part of the Thothmes III. calendar, it is, of course, a fixed point for the Chronology of the 18th Dynasty." Much, of course, depends upon the force of the word, "*if*." This hypothetical way of treating a most important subject always reminds us of the warning of Shakspeare—

"If talk'st thou to me of *ifs*? Thou art a traitor."

It too much resembles the mode by which a distinguished French author endeavours to alter the current of history: "*If*," says M. Victor Hugo, in his *Les Misérables*, "If it had not rained on the night of the 17th to the 18th of June, 1815, the future of Europe would have been changed. A few drops of water, *more or less*, caused the fall of Napoleon." Between the times of Thothmes III. and Rameses II. upwards of two centuries intervened, the former reigning, according to Manetho, early in the seventeenth century B.C., the long reign of the latter extending over the greatest part of the fourteenth century. The Pharaoh who was on the throne, according to the Tablet of Abydos, when the festival of the Dog-star was kept B.C. 1477—1474, being, probably, Rameses I., there is no difficulty in assigning the calendar to his reign, which will accord with both Egyptian and Jewish history, and satisfactorily refute the theo-

ries of those who refuse to give credence to the more probable testimony of the Pentateuch.

In endeavouring to point out the harmony which exists between Egyptology and the story of the Exodus, as recorded in Scripture, the chief element towards a right understanding thereof is unquestionably that true "conception of time" called chronology, from which, as Plato, in the *Timæus*, observes, "we have gained that kind of learning termed philosophy, a better gift than which never was, nor ever will be, conferred by the gods on our mortal race." We have already noticed the exceeding difference between certain Egyptologers concerning the duration of such important epochs as the Rule of the Hycsos and the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt. In this respect, however, they are only faithful copyists of the ancient Egyptian historians themselves; *e.g.*, Manetho, the Sebennyte scribe, for whom the lamented Bunsen entertained so boundless an admiration as to rank him *above* all the writers of Scripture, if the following ascription of praise has any meaning:—

"Grateful I offer to thee whatever through thee I have learned;  
*Truth have I sought at thy hand, Truth have I found by thy aid.*"<sup>b</sup>

Manetho, according to Lepsius' arrangement of his dynasties, places the commencement of the reign of Menes, the proto-monarch of Egypt, and the same as Mizraim, the son of Ham, B.C. 3892. Eratosthenes, the other Egyptian authority, according to Lepsius, dates the reign of Menes B.C. 2900, a slight difference between the two of nearly one thousand years. That Eratosthenes is far nearer the truth we may gather from this simple incident: Manetho states, as Josephus tells us, that the invasion of the Hycsos occurred in the reign of Timæus or Amuntimæus, the last king but one of his twelfth dynasty, and which said king he makes the one hundred and tenth from Menes. Eratosthenes places him as the thirty-eighth king from the time of the first king, which is in accordance with the Tablet of Abydos, the thirty-eighth cartouche in that invaluable register of the ancient Pharaohs being filled with the name of *Pharaoh-En-I-Ma*, the equivalent, in Lower Egypt, to *Amuntimæus* in Upper Egypt, or, as he is more commonly known, *Amenemes III.*

Nevertheless, Eratosthenes is in excess of Scripture chronology, for the commencement of Menes' reign, by several centuries, and it is our present object to shew, from the monuments and the Turin papyrus, that Hebrew and Egyptian chronology are in harmony with each other, and not with the fabulous

---

<sup>b</sup> *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, ii., 392.

figures which have been handed down to us by the above-named Egyptian historians. The Turin papyrus reads, in a fragment marked No. 44, that "three hundred and fifty-seven years had elapsed from the time of Menes to the close of the sixth dynasty." A tomb of a certain priest, discovered by M. Mariette, at Sakkarah, near Memphis, proves that, in the order of succession of the Pharaohic dynasties, the sixth is immediately followed by the twelfth. An existing tomb at Eilethya, in Upper Egypt, belonging to a prince of the time of Pharaoh Amosis, the head of the eighteenth dynasty, who bore the rank of "Admiral of the Nile," contains a genealogical record of much importance in our computation. The names from the time of the original founder of the family, in the reign of Pharaoh Acthoes, who preceded Amenemes I., the head of the twelfth dynasty, are recorded in regular succession from father to son, with the names of their respective wives, through eleven descents. A descent, according to Herodotus (ii., 142), who gives three to a century, may be computed, on the average, as a period of thirty years; consequently, the eleven descents from a time preceding that of Amenemes I. to the reign of Pharaoh Amosis, would represent a period of rather more than three hundred years, which, together with the three hundred and fifty-two years mentioned in the Turin papyrus, would amount to about six and a-half centuries from the time of Menes, the proto-monarch of Egypt, to the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty, when Egyptian history may be considered as determinately fixed as Roman history is, according to Niebuhr, after the irruption of the Gauls. This computation makes the commencement of the Egyptian kingdom to coincide with the middle of the twenty-fourth century B.C., for Dr. Brugsch rightly fixes the beginning of the eighteenth dynasty, upon the authority of Manetho, as B.C. 1707.

Let the following deduction shew how far this chronological system harmonizes with astronomical science. The historian Josephus, who wrote when the records of the Egyptian temples were still in existence, relates that Abraham taught the Egyptians "arithmetic, and the science of astronomy; for, before he went to Egypt, they were unacquainted with that sort of learning." In this, Josephus agrees with Eupolemus, who observes that "Abraham was the inventor of astrology and the Chaldean magic, and that, on account of his exalted piety, he was esteemed by God." Assuming these historical notices concerning Abraham to be true, let us see how far they harmonize with the

---

\* Jos., *Antiq.*, i., viii., 3, and Euseb., *Præp. Evan.*, § ix.

monumental inscriptions of Egypt. It has been stated, and after a prolonged investigation of the subject we are inclined to believe in its correctness, that there does not exist a single record of any Pharaoh or subject, with a date previous to the time of Amenemes I. (*circa* B.C. 200), the head of the twelfth dynasty, in whose reign, or during that of his immediate predecessor, Abraham's visit must have taken place, according to Scripture chronology; whereas tablets and papyri belonging to his reign, and, of course, of all succeeding reigns, with dates inscribed upon them, are not uncommon. In the sepulchral grottos of Bennee-Hasan, in Middle Egypt, there are some hieroglyphic inscriptions belonging to the time of the twelfth dynasty, wherein special mention is made of the "Panegyry of the first year;" referring, as Poole, in his *Horæ Egyptiacæ*, concludes, to the commencement of the Tropical cycle, *i. e.*, a perfectly exact cycle of the sun, moon, and vague year, which the science of astronomy, according to the careful calculations of Professor Airy, made at the Royal Observatory, fixes B.C. 2005, and directly after that the visit of Abraham, according to Hebrew chronology, had taken place.

It has been assumed by Lepsius that the names of months, which are found written with minium on the blocks of the great pyramid of *Dashoor*, shew that the Egyptians had some knowledge of seasons and years prior to the time of Amenemes I. This argument might be of some force if such were found in the pyramids of *Gizeh*, which were certainly built prior to Abraham's visit to Egypt. But it has now been pretty well established that the pyramids of *Dashoor* belong to the Hycsos period,<sup>4</sup> and, consequently, about two centuries later than the time of Amenemes I., and four centuries later than the pyramids of *Gizeh*. Moreover, the Great Pyramid, at the latter place, which elicited Napoleon's famous address to his soldiers when invading Egypt, affords an incidental proof of the harmony between Egyptian and Hebrew chronology, and, so far, of the truth of both. According to the chronological system deducible from the Turin papyrus, the reign of Cheops, the builder of the Great Pyramid, must be dated about the middle of the twenty-second century B.C., and about a century and a half prior to Abraham's visit to Egypt. Sir John Herschel having made a calculation of the exact age of that pyramid, based upon the

---

<sup>4</sup> Hengstenberg mentions, on the authority of Prokesch, the fact that "the bricks of the great pyramid at *Dashoor*, are of fine clay from the Nile, mingled with chopped straw," and considers this an undesigned coincidence in testimony of its application to the tasks which the Egyptians imposed upon the Israelites. — *Egypt and the Books of Moses*, p. 79.

position of the Polar-star at the time of its erection, determined the period to fall within the years B.C. 2171—2123.<sup>c</sup>

Let us see how far this harmonizes with the chronology deducible from Scripture. All parties are agreed respecting the time of the building of Solomon's temple as a well-known and fixed point of history. Mr. Wilson, in his *Essay on the National Church*, says, "The taking of Jerusalem by Shishak (about forty years after it was commenced) is for the Hebrew history that which the taking of Rome by the Gauls is for the Romans."<sup>f</sup> Ussher, Clinton, Bunsen, Brugsch, Rawlinson, Hincks, and other eminent chronologers, place that event in the fourth year of Solomon, B.C. 1014. This may be proved on Gentile authority as follows: Cato, who must have had access to the archives of Carthage, and therefore competent to speak of the fact, says that the city had stood seven hundred and thirty-seven years at the well-known date of its destruction by the Romans, B.C. 146. Carthage then was founded B.C. 146 + 737 = B.C. 883. The Tyrian records, as reported by Menander, state that Carthage was built in the seventh year of Pygmalion, and one hundred and thirty-eight years after the accession of Hiram, who aided Solomon in the building of the temple. This we know was commenced in the fourth year of the reign of Solomon, which synchronizes with the seventh of Hiram. Hence B.C. 883 + 138 - 7 = B.C. 1014.

The Tyrian records afford some assistance in determining another fixed point of great importance for understanding the chronology of the story of the Exodus, viz.: the exact time when the exode of Israel from Egypt took place. Strange to say, this authority, so unexceptionable in itself, seems to have been entirely overlooked by chronologers, both ancient and modern, whose differences as to the time of this memorable epoch in Jewish history may be truly termed *legion*. We read in 1 Kings vi. 1, that "*in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt*, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, he began to build the house of the Lord." This is the only instance which the Bible affords of anything like a recognized era, such as the olympiad or Christian eras. Indeed if the *italicised* part of the text were true Scripture, we should have conclusive evidence respecting the time of the exode by an authority which all Biblical critics allow to be authentic. Many reasons, however, concur to prove that this passage is an interpolation of the third or fourth century of the Christian era.

<sup>c</sup> Nolan's *Egyptian Chron.*, part iii., § 6.

<sup>f</sup> *Essays and Reviews*, p. 170.

This may be seen by considering, 1st. It does not agree with the summation of years given either in the Old or New Testament for that period. 2nd. None of the Jewish historians, such as Demetrius or Josephus; nor of the Christian, such as Clemens Alexandrinus or Julius Africanus, could have known such a passage, for their chronology of that time is essentially different. 3rd. Origen, the great Bibliopole of the third century, quotes the text in his *Commentary on St. John* without the disputed clause, as follows, "They prepared stones and timber three years, and in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, in the month Zif, he began to build the house of the Lord." Origen assuredly would not have omitted the most important clause in the passage, had such existed either in Hebrew or Greek in his day. The Tyrian records, however, enable us to determine the exact interval between the exode and Solomon. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, in the second century, observes, "There is an account among the Tyrian archives about the building of the temple in Judea, which king Solomon built five hundred and sixty-six years after the Jews went out of Egypt." That Theophilus means this as the chronology of the Tyrians, and not of his own, is clear from the fact that he himself computes that interval at about five hundred and forty-two years. The book of Kings records the close connection existing between the kingdoms of Israel and Tyre at the time of the building of the temple. This naturally accounts for the statement appearing in the Tyrian archives respecting the duration of the interval, which must have been as well known to the Jews of that period as the true date of the Norman conquest would be to any educated Englishman in the present day.

Assuming then that the interval between the exode and the building of the temple was exactly five hundred and sixty-six years, if we add them to the ascertained date of the fourth year of Solomon, viz., B.C. 1014, we obtain B.C. 1580 as the true date of the exode; and also a noteworthy synchronism in the histories of Israel, Tyre, and Egypt. According to the computation of Scripture chronology the rise of a "new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph" must synchronize with the death of the patriarch Levi, the last recorded of "that generation," i.e., one hundred and twenty-six years before the exode, or B.C. 1706. That this refers to nothing less than the conquest of the Hyksos by Pharaoh Amosis, the head of the famous eighteenth dynasty, we have abundant evidence to prove; and as the commencement of that dynasty, according to Manetho, is placed

b.c. 1706, we are warranted in accepting this record of a most important event in the history of Egypt, together with the above statement in the Tyrian archives, as a confirmation of the historic truth of the story of the Exodus.

In tracing the harmony which exists between the few incidents recorded in Scripture relating to Egypt, and what is discoverable on the monuments, there is a curious story related of Von Bohlen, a distinguished German critic, seeking to invalidate the authenticity of the Pentateuch, which represents Pharaoh as having bestowed "sheep and oxen" and other gifts upon Abraham, on the ground that no sheep then existed in Egypt, whereas there happens to be very satisfactory monumental proof in confirmation of the Scripture statement. In a tomb near Gizeh bearing the name of Cheops, and of an age anterior to the visit of Abraham, there is a representation of a shepherd counting the flocks committed to his charge. First the oxen numbered eight hundred and thirty-four; then cows, two hundred and twenty; goats, three thousand, two hundred, and thirty-four; asses, seven hundred and sixty; *sheep*, nine hundred and seventy-four; which shews the owner to have been a proprietor of much wealth, and also affords a striking commentary upon the account of the treatment which Abraham received at the hands of Pharaoh.

We come now to the consideration of a very important confirmation of the historic truth of the story of the Exodus in a quarter where few would expect to find it. Bunsen supposed that he had discovered a very happy synchronism between the histories of Israel and Egypt by quoting with approbation the inscription on a tomb of a governor of a district in Upper Egypt, which has been deciphered by Dr. Birch, and which reads as follows:—"When in the time of Sesortosis I. the great famine prevailed in all the other districts of Egypt, there was corn in mine."

Bunsen pronounced this to be a "certain and incontrovertible" proof of the existence of the seven years' famine, which is recorded in Scripture to have taken place during the vice-royalty of Joseph. On the other hand, Dr. Rowland Williams, notwithstanding his high admiration for everything which Bunsen has written, dismisses the learned German's hypothesis with something of a sneer, observing, "Bunsen contends that Abraham's horizon in Asia is antecedent to the first Median conquest of Babylon in 2234. A famine, *conveniently mentioned* under the twelfth dynasty of Egypt, completes his proof."<sup>h</sup>

---

<sup>h</sup> *Essays and Reviews*, pp. 57, 58.

While lamenting the spirit in which Dr. Williams appears to notice this brilliant discovery of Dr. Birch, we may enquire how far this "conveniently mentioned" famine is indeed a proof of the existence of the Israelites in Egypt at that time, and of its referring to the seven years' famine predicted by Joseph. We observe that the hieroglyphic record specifies that the famine in the time of Sesortosis I. did not extend to a certain district in Upper Egypt, though prevailing in all other parts of the country. The account given by Moses of the famine which occurred in Egypt in the time of Joseph, is as follows: "And the seven years of dearth began to come as Joseph had said: and the dearth was *in all lands*; but in all the land of Egypt there was bread. *And the famine was over all the face of the earth.* And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy corn; because that the famine was so sore *in all lands.*" No two records can be more unlike, and it is surprising that so acute a reasoner as Bunsen should have supposed any reference in the one to the other. It affords, however, the usual specimen of how easily some will jump at a hasty conclusion in support of a favourite theory. For without laying undue stress upon the fact that the reign of Sesortosis I., or Sesertesen as Egyptologists now write the name, preceded the time of Joseph by about one hundred years (Bunsen says one thousand two hundred), or that *Lower Egypt* was the locality where the corn had been carefully preserved by Joseph's orders for the use of the people, instead of there being corn in a district of *Upper Egypt*, as was the case in the time of the great famine to which the hieroglyphic inscription refers, it is clear from the book of Genesis that the seven years' famine was *universal*, not merely in Upper Egypt, but throughout Asia and Africa, and indeed wherever man was to be found.

Now the authentic history of a country at the extremity of Asia appears to confirm the fact of this famine in Egypt, both in respect to the time when it occurred and the length it lasted. We read in the annals of the Chinese empire, that "in the beginning of the reign of Ching-tang, the first emperor of the second dynasty, *there happened a drought and famine all over the empire which lasted seven years*, during which time no rain fell."<sup>i</sup> According to the Hebrew chronology the seven years' famine in Egypt occurred B.C. 1796—1789. According to the Chinese chronology, as determined by Couplet and Martinius, the reign of Ching-tang commenced B.C. 1771, and consequently if these two modes of computation be rigidly exact, the seven years'

<sup>i</sup> History of China from Martinius, Couplet and du Halde, as collected in Jackson's *Chronological Antiq.*, ii., 455.



famine in Egypt could not have been the same as that one of equal duration recorded in the annals of China. But inasmuch as an epoch in Hebrew chronology, viz., the interval between the exode and the building of the temple, is in a measure conjectural so far as Scripture is concerned, we are not able to affirm positively that the famine in Egypt occurred at the date to which our computation assigns it. Further, we are less assured of the exact date of the reign of Ching-tang, at the commencement of which the Chinese annals assign the seven years' famine in that country, for this reason. The emperor *Ching-tang* was the founder of the second dynasty, and appears to have waged war with, and eventually to have conquered, his rival *Kie* the seventeenth, and last emperor of the first dynasty. The latter is represented as having reigned fifty-two years, and to have been the greatest monster of vice and cruelty that ever reigned in China. His cruelties are said to have commenced in the nineteenth year of his reign, and to have caused the princes of the empire, headed by *Ching-tang* of the blood-royal, to rise in rebellion against him. The confusion arising out of this civil war makes it less clear than it otherwise would be, when to date the *beginning* of the reign of *Ching-tang*. The reigns of these two emperors extended over a period of sixty-five years, B.C. 1723—1758, during which time a seven years' famine occurred, according to the Chinese annals, throughout the vast empire. And this sufficiently agrees with the Hebrew chronology to warrant our referring it to the seven years' famine, which is said in Genesis to have desolated Egypt, and to have extended "over all the face of the earth."

The Pharaoh to whom Joseph became prime minister, affords another indication of the credibility and veracity of the story of the Exodus as related in Scripture. "All persons," says Syncellus, "are agreed that Joseph was in power in the reign of Apophis." Believing Bunsen *non obstante*, that this is as susceptible of proof, as that Daniel was made "the third,"

---

<sup>1</sup> Why was not Daniel made the *second* ruler in Babylon, as Joseph had been in Egypt, in place of the *third*? The answer to this is one of many instances in which the credibility of Scripture history has been confirmed by the cuneiform inscriptions. It has hitherto been impossible to reconcile the conflicting accounts of Daniel and Berosus, the Chaldean historian, respecting the last of the kings of Babylon, as the former records his death at the time of the capture of the city, while the other states, that when "Cyrus took Babylon, he found not Nabonnedus the king, as he had previously fled to the city or fortress of Borsippa, which Cyrus subsequently captured, when he treated the king with kindness, providing him with an establishment in Carmania, where he spent the remainder of his life." Sir H. Rawlinson has recently deciphered a cuneiform inscription, which relates that the king Nabonnedus had admitted his son Belshar-cesar into partnership with him in the empire. This enables us to reconcile

ruler in the kingdom of Babylon on the night that Belshazzar was slain, or that Sejanus ruled Rome in the name of Tiberius, or that Charles Martel was major of the palace under Childeric, king of France, we are warranted in making use of this well-attested tradition in confirmation of the credibility of the story of the Exodus as set forth in the Pentateuch. Josephus places Apophis the fourth of the six Hycsos or shepherd-kings who reigned in Lower Egypt. Africanus ranks him as the last. Eusebius limits the dynasty to four kings, and calls Apophis the third, whereas Syncellus reverses the order, and makes him the last of the dynasty. Monumental evidence, however, enables us to decide positively thus much; viz., that Salatis conquered Amenemes III., and became the head of the Hycsos dynasty; that Apophis was the most distinguished of the race, both on account of the great length of his reign, and also as being the patron of Joseph; and that Assa, the last of the dynasty, was conquered in his turn by Amosis the head of the famous eighteenth dynasty, after the shepherd-kings had held possession of the country about the space of one hundred years. The question arises, could two succeeding sovereigns, which is all that the tablet of Abydos allows as contemporary Pharaohs in Upper Egypt, during the rule of the shepherd-kings in Lower Egypt, convey the throne down through so long a period as a century? We have no hesitation in replying affirmatively, as we have an instance of a similar occurrence in the history of France for a longer period. Louis XIV. commenced his reign A.D. 1643, and his successor Louis XV. died A.D. 1774, consequently these two carried the throne down a period of one hundred and thirty-one years. We do not deny that there were other contemporary sovereigns reigning over parts of Egypt during this period, besides the two mentioned in the tablet. Indeed, Manetho speaks of "the kings of Thebais" as uniting to expel the shepherd dynasty, and a papyrus of that age proves that there were other Pharaohs besides those whose names were recorded at Abydos, who were evidently contemporary kings, just as there were in England during the heptarchy. An hieroglyphical stelé, recently discovered at Barkal, the contents of which were announced by the Vicomte de Rougé in the *Revue Archéologique* for August, 1863, speaks of *five* Pharaohs reign-

---

Daniel and Berosus at once. Nabonnedus escaped to Borsippa before the final catastrophe; and Belshazzar was reigning in Babylon when the city was captured. Hence the father would naturally be reckoned the *first* ruler; the son, the *second*; and Daniel, the *third*. This is an undesigned coincidence as to the accuracy and authenticity of the Book of Daniel, which some in the present day would do well to consider.

ing together in the eighth century B.C., besides as many independent chieftains claiming rank as kings.

We may assume, therefore, that the tradition of the Greeks respecting Apophis the shepherd-king having been the patron of Joseph is based upon historic truth. A passage in Genesis, which has frequently been a stumbling-block to commentators, appears to confirm this view. We read in Scripture, that when Joseph was about to introduce his brethren to Pharaoh, he prompted them to avow that they were *shepherds*. "It shall come to pass when Pharaoh shall say, What is your occupation? that ye shall say, Thy servants' trade hath been about cattle from our youth even until now, both we and also our fathers: that ye may dwell in the land of Goshen: for *every shepherd is an abomination unto the Egyptians*." It is impossible to explain this advice on the part of Joseph to his brethren otherwise than by concluding that a shepherd dynasty was then reigning in Lower Egypt; for although the final clause, as translated in our Authorized Version, seems to imply the contrary, an attentive consideration of the original shews that it is not so. The Hebrew word *תועבה* undoubtedly means "abomination" as it is here rendered, yet of the ninety passages in which it occurs in the Old Testament, it far more frequently signifies "idols," or objects of worship, which was necessarily "abomination" in the sight of Jehovah. Thus in 2 Kings xxiii. 13, the idolatry of the children of Ammon is described by the same word and translated "abomination." Further, if we take the unpointed Hebrew for our guide, the words *רועה* rendered "shepherd" means likewise "consecrated goats," so that the passage may be correctly translated—"every consecrated goat is an idol or object of worship with the Egyptians." Manetho bears witness that such was the case, for long before the time of the shepherd dynasty, he says, "the bulls Apis in Memphis, and Mnevis in Heliopolis, and the Mendesian goat, were appointed to be gods."<sup>\*</sup>

If, therefore, we are warranted in concluding that Joseph was in power during the rule of the shepherd dynasty, another passage in Scripture points clearly to *Apophis* as being the reigning Pharaoh at that time. When Joseph had satisfactorily interpreted the king's dream, which the Egyptian magi were unable to do, "Pharaoh said unto his servants, Can we find such an one as this is, a man in whom the Spirit of God is? And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath shewed thee all this . . . according unto thy Word shall all my

---

<sup>\*</sup> Euseb., *Chron. Can. Lib. Prior*, cap. xx.

people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou."

Here we have a recognition on the part of a heathen king of the God of Joseph, the only true God, as distinct from the idols of Egypt. A papyrus in the British Museum known as Sallier No. 1, confirms the opinion that Pharaoh Apophis for some cause or other was not a worshipper of the usual Egyptian gods. This papyrus, which is supposed to belong to the nineteenth dynasty, and therefore to be three or four centuries later than the time of which the fragment treats, reads as follows:—

"It came to pass, when the land of Egypt was held by the invaders, when *Skenenra* was ruler of the south, Pharaoh *Apophis* was in his palace of *Avaris*. The whole land paid him homage both with their manufactures in abundance, as well as with all precious things of the north. Now Pharaoh *Apophis* had set up *Soutekh* for his lord; *he worshipped no other god in the whole land*. He erected in his honour a temple of durable workmanship. While *Apophis* was celebrating the dedication of his temple to *Soutekh*, the Prince of the South prepared to build a temple to the sun in opposition."

This singular fact of Pharaoh Apophis being devoted to the worship of *Soutekh* is confirmed by a short hieroglyphic inscription. A granite statue of Pharaoh Rameses II. of the same age as the above quoted papyrus, has upon its right shoulder the two names, enclosed in the usual cartouches, of Pharaoh Apophis, accompanied by the title "Worshipper of the God *Soutekh*." Hence Brugsch justly observes, "The mention of this god in combination with the shepherd-king proves most clearly what is stated in the papyrus concerning Apophis being specially devoted to the worship of this god to the exclusion of all the other deities of the whole country."

Now who was this *Soutekh* whom Pharaoh Apophis exclusively worshipped? Dr. Birch considers that the name *Soutekh*, according to our mode of reading the hieratic characters of the papyri as well as the hieroglyphics of the monuments, means simply "God, the true God, the one only God as distinct from all other heathen deities." Believing this to be a true explanation of the term, we see in this remarkable incident a striking confirmation of the story of the Exodus as recorded in Genesis; and can understand what is meant, when we read of a Pharaoh *Manepthah* worshipping together with other Egyptian deities "the God *Soutekh* of *Avaris*," which signified none other than "Jehovah the God of the city of the Hebrews."

Accepting Ewald's definition that "Avaris" philologically means "the city of the Hebrews," and referring it with Sir Gardner Wilkinson to *Heliopolis*, "the abode of the sun," as its hieroglyphic equivalent signifies, we can see, in the mention of Pharaoh having bestowed on Joseph "the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On," i.e., priest or prince of Heliopolis, according to the Septuagint, an incidental proof that the author of the Pentateuch must have been living in Egypt, and well acquainted both with its topography and history; for had he been living, as some critics in the present day conclude, about five centuries later than the time of Moses, he would have laid the scene of Joseph's triumphs at *Thebes* (the capital of Upper Egypt in the time of Samuel) in place of Heliopolis, or Avaris, the chief city of the shepherd-kings. Moreover, the very fact of no mention whatever of Thebes, the renowned capital of Upper Egypt, as early as the twelfth dynasty, in Scripture, is a negative proof that Joseph was chief minister to one of the shepherd-kings, whose residence during the whole of their rule was assuredly in Lower Egypt.

As the fact of Pharaoh *Apophis* being a worshipper of a deity whom we believe to be the god of the Hebrews, supports the general tradition of the Greeks that he was Joseph's patron, so an incident in the time of Pharaoh *Assa*, the last of the shepherd-kings previous to their expulsion by Pharaoh Amosis, adds additional confirmation to this opinion. According to Scripture chronology and history, "Joseph died, being one hundred and ten years old when they embalmed him, and placed him in a coffin in Egypt," before the rise of the "new king or dynasty which knew not Joseph;" and which must therefore have been during the reign of Pharaoh *Assa*. In the *Bibliothèque Imperiale* at Paris, there is a papyrus brought by M. Prisse d'Avennes from Egypt about twenty years ago, which was written, as the internal evidence shews, in the time of that same Pharaoh. It must have been written before the birth of Moses, and is most probably the oldest MS. in the world. The Rev. D. Heath in England, and M. Chabas in France, have both attempted translations of this valuable record. We quote from the translation of the latter, as being the most satisfactory of the two, though on the chief point of importance there is no difference between them.

M. Chabas reads the passage in question as follows:—

---

<sup>1</sup> M. De Rougé considers that Avaris and Zoan are the same, and that the Hebrew נָחָא, "he moved tents," is equivalent to the Egyptian *Ha-Wur*, "the place of departure."—*Revue Archæologique*, 1861, p. 250.

"C'est ainsi que j'acquis pont toi santé du corps et paix du roi en toutes circonstances, et que tu parcoureras des années de vie sans fausseté. *J'ai parcouru 110 ans de vie* par le don du roi et l'approbation des anciens, en remplissant mon devoir envers le roi dans le lieu de sa faveur."

There is in the British Museum an inscription in the hieratic character, dated the twenty-first year of the reign of Pharaoh *Amenophis III.*, i. e., circa one hundred and fifty years after the time of *Assa*, in which certain benefactions are promised to the recipients of the royal favour, "during the days when they shall repose in the place of the departed *after one hundred and ten years.*" A funeral inscription at the same place relating to a functuary named *Raka*, under the nineteenth or succeeding dynasty, reads thus—"Adoration to Osiris, worship to Onnophris, who granted me repose in the tomb *after one hundred and ten years upon earth.*" Two papyri likewise in the British Museum, named respectively Anastasi 3 and 4, and referring to the times of the nineteenth dynasty, contain the following expressions—"Thou approachest the place of the departed without growing old, *without being feeble; thou completest one hundred and ten years upon earth, thy limbs being still vigorous.*" . . . "Thou completest *one hundred and ten years upon earth*, and thou repositest on the brow of the hill."

These various inscriptions, which extend over a period of four centuries, seem to indicate that the expression "one hundred and ten years" was proverbial amongst the ancient Egyptians of the extreme of human longevity. Considering that this can be traced up to the time of a certain Pharaoh in whose reign Joseph died, and remembering the great benefactor which the patriarch had been to the nation according to Mosaic history, and which would naturally lead the Egyptians to retain a fond recollection of the years of his life, so as subsequently to give rise to a proverb amongst them regarding it, we may accept this as a strong confirmation of the historic truth of what has been denied by some, viz., the age attributed to him in Genesis, where it is said, as we have already noticed, that he died when he had attained the age of one hundred and ten.

Bunsen having decided that "the one hundred and ten years of Joseph could not be historical," has selected "seventy-eight" as the correct age of the patriarch according to his own view of the way in which Scripture history ought to have been written.<sup>m</sup> There are, however, notwithstanding all that has been said to the contrary, well authenticated instances of persons in

<sup>m</sup> *Egypt's Place in Univ. Hist.*, iv., iii., § 1.

modern days who have attained a greater age than that of the patriarch Joseph. There is the well-established case of the Countess of Desmond, who danced with Richard of Gloucester in the reign of Edward IV., lived all through the Tudor dynasty, and visited the court of James I. with a view to get the attainder of her deceased husband repealed, dying at the age of one hundred and forty. The churchyard of Ware, in Herts, is said to contain a tomb thus inscribed:—"In memory of William Mede, M.D., who departed this life the 28th of October, 1852, aged one hundred and forty-eight years, nine months, three weeks, and four days." The *Sydney Empire* newspaper of this year, mentions that there are now living at Marulan in that colony, a man and his wife, aged respectively one hundred and eleven and one hundred and seven years. They are extremely feeble, but in possession of both sight and hearing. Such are some of the modern cases of longevity, and it surely does not require any great stretch of faith to believe that Joseph attained the age of one hundred and ten, when the average duration of life in that age was probably higher than it is now.

With the death of Joseph and his brethren, and all that generation, the affliction of the Israelites may be said to have commenced. The Scripture record is very decisive on this point: "Now there arose up a new king over Egypt, which knew not Joseph. And he said unto his people, Behold, the people of the children of Israel are more and mightier than we: let us deal wisely with them, and so get them out of the land. Therefore they set over them task-masters, to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh treasure-cities, Pithom and Raamses." Admitting that Joseph and his brethren were befriended by the Hycsos or shepherd kings, it was natural that the new dynasty which expelled them should treat the Israelites in a very different manner from that which they had previously experienced. The agreement, therefore, between Jewish and Egyptian history\* is very striking, when Amosis the head of the famous eighteenth dynasty had succeeded in expelling the Hycsos, his first step was to inflict heavy burdens upon a class of his subjects of whom he was naturally apprehensive, by compelling them to build treasure-cities or rather fortresses called Pithom and Raamses, or Rameses. The first of these names presents no difficulty. By universal admission it has been identified with the *Patamos* mentioned by Herodotus. *Rameses*, however, has been considered a difficulty, inasmuch as

---

\* It is equally so in chronology, as Scripture and the lists of Manetho alike date the rise of the eighteenth dynasty, which "knew not Joseph," B.C. 1707. See Dr. Brugsch's *Hist. d'Egypt.*

the first Pharaoh of that name belongs to a period subsequent to the Exodus of the Israelites. The name, however, unquestionably appears in Egyptian history at this very period. For the husband of queen Aah-hotep (memorials from the tomb of this sovereign were exhibited at the International Exhibition of 1862, by M. Mariette), and father of Pharaoh Amosis bore the name of Raames, and the son of this Amosis was called Rameses. Nothing can be more likely than that one of the "treasure-cities," built by the enslaved Israelites, should be called after the prince royal of the reigning Pharaoh. The word itself signifies *Son of the sun*, and had an undoubted connection with Heliopolis *the city of the sun*, which was not far from Goshen, or the Delta of the Nile, where the Israelites received their first settlement, when "the best of the land" was given them by Pharaoh's command, and which subsequently bore the name of the "land of Rameses," when Moses lived and wrote.

The son and successor of Amosis is known as *Chebron*-Amenophis I., and in the Alexandrian chronicle, the Pharaoh under whom Moses was brought up after having been preserved by his daughter, is called *Kenebron* or *Chebron*. It is not quite certain whether this princess called *Amense* by Manetho, and read *Set-Amen* on the monuments, was the daughter or sister of *Chebron*; but what is of much more importance for confirming the story of the Exodus is that there was a queen regnant for some years at that period of Egyptian history, who had sufficient authority to compel a jealous priesthood to train her adopted child Moses in all the mysteries of the national religion, as well as to be able to offer him the succession to her throne as Scripture represents. Moreover, we have monumental evidence that this queen during her life bore the title which is exclusively applied to her in the Book of Exodus. On an obelisk erected by herself at Thebes, and which is one of the most splendid monuments of that mighty necropolis, she bears amongst other titles such as "royal wife," "lady of both countries," "great royal sister," the significant one of "*Pharaoh's daughter*." Although Moses refused to be called "the son of Pharaoh's daughter," his position in the court of the sovereign during the earlier part of his life previous to his retiring to Midian, would naturally account for his being "mighty in words and deeds," as Stephen in his address to the rulers at Jerusalem terms him, and may serve to explain the story, which Josephus and Irenæus relate, of his fame as general of the Egyptian army in the war against Ethiopia, as well as to account for the statement in



the Book of Numbers that "Moses married an *Ethiopian* woman."

At the village of Gournon, near Thebes, there still exists the tomb of a prince whose name in hieroglyphics reads *Ros-she-ra*. He appears to have belonged to the court of Thothmes III., the Pharaoh who eventually obtained the throne which Moses had refused. The paintings on this tomb, which are given with extreme accuracy in Lepsius' *Denkmäler*, afford indisputable proof not only of the Israelites having been in Egypt at this period of history, but of having been forcibly engaged in the very occupation to which they were compelled by the jealousy of that dynasty "which knew not Joseph." An inscription on the tomb reads—"The reception of the tribute of the land brought to the king by the *captives* in person;" which accords with what Manetho says so far as the confusion, which Josephus makes in mixing up the Hycsos with the Israelites, will allow. Josephus quotes Manetho as observing—"That the nation called *shepherds* were also captives in their sacred books," to which Josephus adds, "and not without a reason, since one of our ancestors, viz., Joseph, told the king of Egypt that he was a *captive*." The captives who are pictured on the tomb of *Ros-she-ra* are engaged in the occupation of making bricks, and carefully overlooked by Egyptian taskmasters. Some of them possess the unmistakable features of the Jewish people, which are so clearly depicted as to leave little room for doubt, but that this tomb presents a very striking commentary upon the affliction of the Israelites. Heeren in his *Göttl. Anz.*, observes concerning it—"If this painting represents the servitude of the children of Israel, it is equally important for exegesis and chronology. For exegesis, because it would be a strong proof of the great antiquity of the Mosaic writings, and especially of the Book of the Exodus, which in chapters one and five gives a description that applies most accurately to this painting, even in unimportant particulars. For chronology, since it belongs to the eighteenth dynasty under the dominion of Thothmes III., and would therefore give a fixed point both for profane and sacred history."

The hieroglyphic inscriptions belonging to the two following reigns of Amenophis II. and Thothmes IV. throw but little light on the story of the Exodus. Rosellini mentions that "the bricks which are now found in Egypt belonging to the period of Thothmes IV. have always straw mingled with them," which fact, though it proves nothing, is only what we expect from the narrative in the Pentateuch. It is certain from the monuments that the reign of Thothmes IV. was a brief one, which agrees with what is related of Moses' return from Midian to Egypt on

the death of one of the persecuting Pharaohs, and the subsequent deliverance of the Israelites from bondage not long after. Much confusion appears in the historical records of this particular period. Sir Gardner Wilkinson entertained at one time the opinion that Amenophis III., the undoubted successor of Thothmes IV., had an elder brother. The presumption, however, which appears most probable, is that he was of a different race altogether from that of his predecessor; which may be accounted for on the supposition that Thothmes IV. was indeed the Pharaoh who lost his life in the Red Sea; as it would accord with the statement in Exodus, "that at midnight the Lord smote all the first-born in the land of Egypt, from the *first-born of Pharaoh* that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon." That Thothmes IV. was the Pharaoh of the Exode seems to be confirmed by the fact that, after all the careful researches of the moderns, *no trace has been found of this king's tomb* in the royal burial-place, near Thebes where the sovereigns of the eighteenth dynasty are deposited, though the tomb of his successor has been discovered in a valley adjoining the cemetery of the other kings.

Some Egyptologists have identified Thothmes IV. with Armais of the same dynasty, who is said by Manetho to have reigned five years before he was expelled from Egypt by his brother, and to have fled to Greece, where he founded the city of Argos. This tradition respecting the early colonization of Greece from Egypt, is as near the truth as Herodotus's (ii. 142) version of the destruction of Sennacherib's host which he received from the Egyptian priests, and we may understand it as confirming the account in Exodus of the overthrow of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea. We have the very highest authority for placing the commencement of the kingdom of Greece, which was colonized from Egypt, at the same period which the Hebrew chronology gives for the date of the Exodus, viz., B.C. 1580. The Arundellian marbles, which were engraved at Paros B.C. 264, open with this announcement: "Since Cecrops reigned at Athens, and the country was called Actica, from Actæus the native, one thousand three hundred and eighteen years have elapsed."<sup>p</sup> Now  $1318 + 264 = \text{B.C. } 1582$ .

This conclusion is further confirmed by the general opinion respecting the time of the Exode. Clemens Alexandrinus specifies that it was "three hundred and forty-five years before the beginning of the Sothaic period." This is known to have been

<sup>p</sup> *Marmora Arundelliana*, p. 6; Selden's edition: London, 1628. This is one of the few inscriptions which was uninjured when Selden lived and published his work.

an Egyptian cycle of one thousand four hundred and sixty years; and upon the testimony of Censorinus, who was contemporary with one such period, to have happened respectively in the years A.D. 139 and B.C. 1322. Now  $B.C. 1322 + 345 = B.C. 1667$ , when according to the Greeks the Exode was supposed to have occurred. But this date clearly proves that the Greeks confounded, as we have before noticed was the case with Josephus, the expulsion of the Hyksos, commenced by Amosis and completed by Thothmes III., with the Exodus of Israel. It was natural that the Greeks should make this confusion on account of the way in which Manetho, the national historian, records that event. He says that, "the shepherds were subdued by a king named Alisphragmuthosis (Amosis), and driven out of other parts of Egypt, and shut up in a place containing ten thousand acres called *Avaris*, where they were subsequently besieged by Thothmes, the son (or descendant) of Alisphragmuthosis, with four hundred and eighty thousand men, and that in despair of success he compounded with them to quit Egypt with their families and their goods. On which they departed not fewer in number than two hundred and forty thousand, and took their journey from Egypt through the wilderness for Syria, where they built a city, and named it *Jerusalem*, in a country now called *Judea*. . . . It was also reported that the priest who ordained their government and their laws was by birth of *Helio- polis*, and his name *Osarsiph* from *Osyris*, who was the god of Heliopolis; but that when he was gone over to these people his name was changed, and he was called *Moses*."<sup>†</sup> That Manetho confounded the two events, viz., the expulsion of the Hyksos by Thothmes III., B.C. 1667, and the Exodus of the Israelites in the time of Thothmes IV., B.C. 1580 is very evident; but what little he says on the subject, according to the fragments of his history which remain, confirms in some degree the account recorded in Scripture of the Exode.

Moreover, the opinion that Thothmes IV. was the Pharaoh who was lost with his army in the Red Sea, is supported by the historical fact that a very remarkable change in the national religion of Egypt occurred during the reign of his immediate successor Amenophis III. This we might naturally expect from the failure of the Egyptian priesthood to ward off the heavy judgments with which their country had been recently visited by the God of Israel, and which must have been patent to the nation at large. Dr. Birch informs us that "in the reign of Amenophis III. the worship of the *Aten* or *Aten-ra*, the sun's

---

<sup>†</sup> Manetho apud Josephus contr. Apion I., § 14, 26.

disk or orb first appears. This name, which resembles that of the Hebrew  $\text{אֲדֹנָי}$ , Adonai or Lord, and the Syrian Adonis appears to have been either a foreign religion introduced into Egypt, or else a part of the sun worship, which had assumed an undue influence or development." Further, Sir Gardner Wilkinson considers that, "though Amenophis III. calls himself the son of Thothmes IV. there is reason to believe that he was *not* of pure Egyptian race. His features differ very much from those of other Pharaohs; and the respect paid to him by some of the 'stranger kings' seems to confirm this, and to argue that he was partly of the same race as those kings who afterwards usurped the throne, and made their name and rule so odious to the Egyptians." This conclusion is perfectly reconcilable with the fact that the eldest son of the Pharaoh, who was drowned in the Red Sea, did not succeed his father on the throne.

Considering that the Hebrew chronology of this period agrees with the Tyrian annals as regards the time of the Exode, and with the Egyptian chronology given by Manetho in respect to the rise of that famous dynasty "which knew not Joseph;" that the tablet of Abydos in our National Museum affords us an authentic register of the successive Pharaohs from the time of Abraham to Moses; that the objection which has been made against the credibility of Genesis in consequence of sheep being said to have existed in very early times in Egypt, has been set aside by monumental proof to the contrary; that the idea promulgated by ancient historians of Abraham having taught the Egyptians astronomy, is very probable from the fact of no signs of any measure of time having been discovered previous to his visit to the country, and of their being subsequently found in great abundance; that the account of the seven years' famine "in all lands," during the vice-royalty of Joseph in Egypt, is confirmed by the record in the Chinese annals of a famine of similar duration at the same period; that the tradition current amongst the Greeks that Joseph's Pharaoh was named *Apophis*, agrees very well with the incidental notices in the story of the Exodus respecting him, and especially with the proof both from the papyri and the monuments, that he rejected the idols of Egypt for the exclusive worship of *Soutech*, whom there is reason to believe means none other than the "God of Israel;" that a common proverb amongst the Egyptians representing extreme old age by the term "one hundred and ten years" can be traced back through several centuries to the time of that Pharaoh in whose reign Joseph died, according to Hebrew chronology; that

\* *Archæological Journal*, vol. viii., p. 405.

\* Rawlinson's *Herod*, app. to book ii., c. viii., § 21.

the expression "every shepherd is an abomination with the Egyptians" is in reality an incidental proof that a shepherd dynasty was reigning in Egypt, when Pharaoh allotted the best of the land to the pastoral family of Jacob and his children; that the conquest of the shepherd-kings by Pharaoh Amosis, the head of the eighteenth dynasty, synchronizes perfectly according to Egyptian chronology with the rise of that king who "knew not Joseph;" that, as this Pharaoh had a son named *Rameses*, it is more than probable that one of the "treasure cities," which he compelled the Israelites to build, should be called after his son's name; that a queen regnant is found in Egyptian history within half a century of the last named event, who bears on an existing monument at Thebes the significant title of "Pharaoh's daughter;" that a tomb at the same place of the time of her immediate successor has a pictorial representation of the Jews engaged in making bricks with Egyptian taskmasters standing over them; that no tomb has been discovered of Pharaoh *Thothmes IV.*, whose reign was certainly a brief one, and who, it has been supposed, was the Pharaoh drowned in the Red Sea; that this sovereign was not succeeded by his eldest son, which agrees with the Scripture narrative respecting the destruction of the "first-born in the land of Egypt, from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon;" and, lastly, that during the reign of his immediate successor *Amenophis III.*, a very marked change took place in the national religion of Egypt. Considering all these, and various other incidents of a similar nature, we may fairly conclude that their united testimony affords some confirmation for the credibility and veracity of the story of the Israelites in Egypt as detailed at length in the sacred oracles of God.

B. W. SAVILE.

---

"The Word of God, even God himselfe, by whome the worlde was made,  
 Eternall is, and guideth right, all thinges in happie trade.  
 This Worde of strength, of life, and grace, whose heavenly ioyes excell,  
 Came downe to earth, It tooke our fleshe, to save our soules from hell.  
 This worde most true, al pure and cleane, from good men may not slide,  
 For it as light, and life of soule, with them must still abide.  
 Wey not the willes of wicked wights, which laughe this Word to scorne,  
 Them it wil waste, and soone confound, as damned and forlorn."

*Thomas Palfreyman, 1578.*

### THE TREE OF LIFE.

FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. PIPER.

(Continued from Vol. IV., p. 393.)

#### II. *The application of the tree of life to the person of Christ.*

—1. On the human appearance of Christ upon earth, the tree of life, as applied to Him, is never mentioned in the Gospel. And this is certainly not without design : not only to avoid a misconception in regard to paradise, but also because a difference of position and of purpose came in for consideration, for the tree of life has its place before the beginning of sin, and after its abolition, whereas Christ enters midway between these into the sinful world. At the same time the New Testament contains manifold allusions and figures, out of which a parallel between the two evidently arises.

For, so far as *life* is concerned, Christ calls himself "the Life" (John xi. 25 ; xiv. 6). He is commended by Peter as "the Prince of Life" (Acts iii. 15) ; and by Paul he is called "our Life" (Col. iii. 4). And so far as the tree is concerned, the Messiah is called a "Branch" and a "Root of Jesse" (Isaiah xl. 1, 10) ; a righteous branch of David (Jer. xxiii. v. ; xxxiii. 15) ; the Branch, by Zechariah (iii. 8 ; vi. 12) ; and in the more extended representation of Ezekiel (xvii. 22, 23), a tender twig planted upon a high mountain and eminent, which shall grow to a goodly cedar under which shall dwell all fowl of every wing. Christ moreover, calls himself the True *Vine*, and his people the branches (John xv. 1—5).

In this connection, when we compare and consider that Christ is "the bread of life" (John vi. 35, 48), which, when eaten of takes away all hunger and gives eternal life (v. 35, 58), and that he has living water (iv. 10, 11) which quenches all thirst, and is a well of water springing up into everlasting life (ver. 14, 7, 38) ;—that he is himself life, as well as the vine, in which his people abiding, have life and bear fruit, we can have no difficulty in recognizing in him the tree of life, and all the more that that "wisdom," which in him visibly appeared in the flesh, is called in the Old Testament a tree of life (Prov. iii. 18).

2. In the Church, too, from the first the tree of life has had this application. Justin Martyr declares it to be a symbol of him who after he has been crucified shall again appear in glory. Origen draws from the tree planted by the water courses (Psalm i. 3) a reference to Christ, while its unfading leaves are his

words, recognizing in Him a tree of life, since He is the wisdom and she is a tree of life to all who lay hold on her (Prov. iii. 18). In this the usual opposer of the allegoric interpretation of Origen, Methodius, bishop of Tyre, agrees (died A.D. 311). Again, a follower of the theology of Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, draws a comparison in the same manner, and contrasts, in an Easter sermon, the new life in Christ with the life of the old man, the state in Paradise after the fall. "Then, says he, "we kept ourselves concealed under the fig-tree, out of shame, now we come in glory to the tree of life; then we were driven out of Paradise for disobedience, now through faith we are admitted to Paradise. Again, the tree of life may be eaten of by the fallen; again, the water of Paradise that divided itself into four streams flows through every land where the Gospel comes." And Epiphanius, in a homily on the Great Sabbath, calling to mind the descent of Christ into hell, wherein he evidently had before him the so-called gospel of Nicodemus, introduces the Lord speaking as he speaks to Adam, "I remove thee from this prefigurative tree of life; but, behold me myself, I am the life united with thee." Farther, Anastasius Sinaita observes, that Jesus himself calls himself so, in support of which he quotes the words in reference to the good tree, whose fruit is good (Matt. xii. 33), and also from Luke xxiii. 31, "if they do these in a green tree." And Macarius Chrysocephalus, archbishop of Thessalonica, in a sermon on the feast of the Elevation on the Cross, in a passage already mentioned, where he speaks of the tree of life as a prize which man would have received if he had kept the command of God, and in which He calls the tree of life a type of the cross, applies it immediately afterwards to Christ himself, quoting Psalm i. 3, "But Christ the wood of immortality, the tree of eternal life planted by the streams of water in the new paradise of Holy Scripture and nailed on the cross for me, the bread of life, the vine of immortality, has not only given me being, which I had lost, but also to be happy and to live for ever."

It is the same in the Latin Church. We have already seen how Ambrose in his allegoric interpretation of paradise passes over from the tree of life to Christ. In the interpretation of the first Psalm he explains the tree planted by the rivers of water, as the tree of life which grew in paradise out of the earth among the other trees: but this is no other than He through whom we have salvation. It is said by him that the earth brought it forth as the Virgin brought forth Christ, and that it stands amid the other trees as Jesus among his disciples (John i. 26; Luke xxiii. 27). Besides, Solomon speaks of Him (Prov. iii. 18.) In this Psalm, then, the man is called blessed who

follows the Lord Jesus, who is the tree of life, the tree of wisdom. Augustine, on the other hand, maintains in opposition to the merely allegoric interpretation the reality of an earthly paradise, but at bottom he makes the allegoric also available, and that too in a double sense: he takes the tree of life as well in the moral sense, according to which it signifies the mother of all good (wisdom),—as in reference to the Church, according to which it signifies Christ the Saint of saints, both of which follow since Christ himself is the wisdom of God, of whom Solomon speaks, that she is a tree of life to all who lay hold on her. And this meaning he maintains to be no after-development, but to be originally given with the tree. “God would not permit,” says he, “that man should live in paradise without the mystery of spiritual things, which were bodily presented to him.” Accordingly man received from the other trees his food, but in the tree of life he had a SACRAMENT; the word equivalent to mystery, which he had used above. This sentiment of his (in lignis cæteris erat *alimentum* in illo autem *sacramentum*,) has been frequently quoted since by ecclesiastical writers. In the middle ages, and as far on as the ninth century, this interpretation of Augustine from his work on the Kingdom of God, is endorsed by Rhabanus Maurus, while Remigius monk at Auxerre, in his commentary on the first Psalm, follows Ambrosius; but as to the tree planted by the rivers of water, signifying Christ, he cites the words of Christ (Matt. xii. 33; Luke xxiii. 31), which are appealed to in the same sense by Anastasius Sinaita. The *Clavis*, by Melito, lately published, a collection of the figurative expressions of Scripture arranged according to subjects, explains indeed the tree and the word in the two places, Psalm i. 3 and Luke xxiii. 31, as an image of Christ (whereto Rhabanus Maurus, who had this key before him, agrees), but it is only in a manuscript addition somewhere about the eleventh century, that the tree of paradise is included in these comparisons. Among the mystics of the middle ages, Hugo of St. Victor chiefly deserves mention, (died 1141), who, alluding to the allegoric explanation of paradise according to which it signifies the Church, says of Christ,—“He stands in the middle of his Church as the everlasting tree of life whose fruits give to the strong nourishment, and to the weak shelter.” And Bonaventura in this reference defends the tree of life against the reproach that it was perishable; for although the first man did not find sustentation in it, yet his posterity learned that by that tree they should understand Christ. Connected with this, in the Marian Psalter of the thirteenth century, the salutation of Mary is understood as that



of the tree of life, since Christ is praised as its fruit by Bonaventura,<sup>a</sup> and Edmund of Canterbury.<sup>b</sup>

Finally, in the Protestant Church, Calvin, in the interpretation of the Mosaic record, follows the opinion of Augustine and Eucherius, that the tree of life was a type of Christ, inasmuch as he is the eternal Word of God; indeed only in this view, he maintains, could the tree have been the symbol of life. Luther, also, who condemns all profitless allegorizings of the account of paradise, and who in this attributes above all to Origen "very silly thoughts," still includes among allegories which have a certain foundation in the letter, that as the tree of death is the law, so the tree of life is the Gospel or Christ.

The reference of the tree of life to the PERSON of Christ has received a very peculiar expression, in which also the WORK of Christ is included, in the *Legend of the Oil of Mercy*, for which Adam in his death-sickness prays of the tree; whereupon he is referred to the anointing and redemption through the Son of God. To this legend, which can shew evidence of its existence from the second to the eighteenth century, we shall now turn our attention.

#### *The Legend of the Oil of Mercy.*

1. The Epistle to the Hebrews applies the words of the forty-fifth Psalm, "Therefore hath God, even thy God, anointed thee with the oil of gladness" (Heb. i. 9), to the inauguration of Christ, as eternal king, after the completion of the work of redemption on earth,—a transition from the real anointing of the kings of Judah to a spiritual anointing. On the other hand, a writing of the second century, taking the name Jesus as that of the Messiah or anointed, gives a material explanation of the unction which is put into the mouth of Peter; that the Father first anointed with the oil which came from the tree of life the Son of God, who, as the beginning of all things, already appeared in the person of Adam. He himself will also, according to the ordination of the Father, anoint with a like oil all the godly

<sup>a</sup> Bonaventura, *Psalterium minus B. Mariæ Virg. quinquag. i. 1—4.* Opera xiii. 362.

"Ave Virgo vitæ lignum,  
Quæ pereni laude dignum,  
Salvo voto quod vovisti  
Mundo fructum attulisti."

And more fully in the *Laus B. Virg. Mar.*, fig. ii.; *Ibid.*, p. 354.

<sup>b</sup> Edmund of Canterbury, cir. 1240. *Psalter B. Mar. Virg. Carmin.*, at the beginning,—

"Ave Virgo lignum vitæ  
Quæ dedisti fructum vitæ  
Saluti fidelium."

*Greith Spicileg. Vatic.*, p. 135.

when they enter his kingdom, to refresh them after their work, that their light also may shine, and that filled with the Holy Ghost they may be made partakers of immortality. Such an anointing is attributed to the real Adam in the second part of the so-called gospel of Nicodemus, which probably dates also from the second century, and which makes Seth relate to the fathers in the underworld, on the occasion of the baptism of Christ, how Adam, seized with a mortal disease, sends his son to pray God at the gate of paradise, that he would lead him by the angel to the tree of mercy, and that he might take the oil so that his father might recover (the oil being taken for a pledge of mercy from the similarity in sound of the words *ἐλαιον* and *ἐλεος*). Seth did as his father desired. After his prayer the angel of the Lord (in the Latin translation the archangel Michael) came and said to him, "Seth, what wilt thou? Dost thou desire the oil which raises up the sick, and the tree which yields the oil, on account of the weakness of thy father? This thou canst not have; go and say that after the completion of fifty-five hundred years from the creation of the world, the only-begotten Son of God will descend to earth and become man; he will anoint thy father with this oil, and will ascend (to heaven) . . . and then he will be healed of all disease; but now that cannot be done." To this is to be attached a narrative in a Greek fragment upon the life of Adam and Eve (perhaps from the so-called Little Genesis), which is said to have been revealed to Moses by the archangel, Michael. At the desire of the sick Adam, Eve goes with Seth to Paradise, with earth upon her head, and bathed in tears, to entreat the Lord that he will send his angel to give to them of the oil of paradise, with which to anoint and to restore Adam. Thereupon Michael appears and says, "Seth must not trouble himself about this oil for the anointing of his father, for now he cannot obtain it; but in the last times all flesh shall rise again, that is, all who are holy; and then shall all the joys of paradise be given to them." A new version of the legend appears in the oriental Christian Book of Adam, and here the fruit of the tree, instead of the oil, is spoken of. After the first pair had spent forty-three days in sorrow and distress, and in their hunger desired to eat of the fruits of the garden, God sent a cherub to them with two figs. And when they saw that these were from the trees among which they had hid themselves, and remembered that they had then perceived their nakedness, they refrained from the fruit and prayed God, "O give to us of the fruit of the tree of life, that we may eat and live, and may not again have to bear the sorrows of earth." Upon which the word of the Lord came to Adam,

saying, "Adam, from the tree of life for which thou prayest, I cannot yet give to thee the fruit; but after fifty-five hundred years have been fulfilled, I will give to thee to eat thereof, that thou mayest live for ever, thou, and Eve, and all the faithful of thy seed. . . . Rest in patience till the covenant which I have made with thee shall be fulfilled."

2. In the middle ages the tradition branches out into various ramifications. Here and there the legend has been adopted just as it stands in the gospel of Nicodemus, of which a Latin translation of the ninth century, and which is in the library of Einsiedeln, is known. It was afterwards received by Vincentius of Beauvais, in the thirteenth century, as well as in the Golden Legend of Jacobus à Voragine, and here, indeed, twice, and with references to its origin.

Somewhat embellished it appears in the French translation of a Latin book, *De poenitentia Adami*, which still exists in manuscript at Paris. It has been also made use of in a French drama of the birth of Christ, in the fifteenth century, which commences with the creation of Adam and the fall; with the difference that Adam himself dying and realizing hell, prays for the oil of mercy to God, who exhorts him to bear death with patience, and promises him redemption from the pains of hell after fifty-five hundred years, expressly through the blood of the Son of God, which will flow from his hands, feet, and side. Then follows the sending of Seth to paradise, who again begs the oil for his dying father, on which he is made a partaker of the peace which God has promised to his own people. In the answer, however, which God sends by Raphael there appears another legend; for the angel, instead of giving to Seth the oil which he begs, breaks off for him a branch of the tree of knowledge, which he is to plant on Adam's grave,—to which we shall return.

Let us, first of all, follow the course of the first tradition in the German and Netherlandish literature.<sup>c</sup> A poem of the thirteenth century, under the title *Die Urstende*, treats of the descent of Christ to hell, following closely the relation contained in the so-called gospel of Nicodemus; when called upon by Adam, Seth reports to the fathers in hell as follows:—

"When under weight of years my father lay  
At point of death he spake, Go thou, my son,  
Straight to the gate of paradise, and there

---

<sup>c</sup> The word we have rendered "Netherlandish" is "Niederdeutsch" in some places in the text, but not here. Neither "Low German" nor "Dutch" seem to convey all that is meant.—Tr.

Thou shalt a tree behold, 'tis called the tree  
 Of mercy. Go, my son, and see if thou  
 Can'st gain for me a portion of that oil  
 Which trickles from its trunk; for its sweet balm  
 Will make me well again."

He describes the difficulty of the way thither, and the hardships he suffered, because his food failed; and how the wind which blew from paradise breathed joy into him. His entrance into paradise, however, was interdicted by an angel, who also denied him the oil for which he asked:—

"Where goest thou, Seth? and Seth replied, My lord,  
 I came to beg your highness' aid to lead  
 Me to the place where stands the sacred tree  
 Of mercy, that taking of its healing oil,  
 I may my father heal. To which he said,  
 Thou may'st not enter, Seth, for paradise  
 Is barred to mortal man since that dread day  
 When Adam was sent forth, nor erst before  
 Five thousand and five hundred years have rolled,  
 And fifty-five; until He come," etc. etc.

About the same time we find this tradition treated at length, and joined to another which makes reference to the cross of Christ, in a Netherlandish poem on the wood of the cross (*Dboec vanden hout*), which, however, is doubtless drawn from a Latin source, which it also cites (v. 314). The author is generally held to be Jacob Van Maerlant, who died at Damm, near Bruges, in the year A.D. 1300, and who is celebrated as the father of Netherlandish poetry. The poem, which consists of seven hundred and eighty verses, has been several times printed, and was last published among the works of the Society for the promotion of old Netherlandish poetry (1844). The oil of mercy, it is here said, was promised to Adam by God at the expulsion from Eden; the tree of life is not expressly mentioned (but all the more the tree of knowledge), but the oil, which is referred to the consolation at the coming of Christ, is placed in a closer association with his person. Otherwise the incidents are as above-mentioned, with manifold additions and enlargements, especially that Seth succeeds in getting into paradise, or at least in getting his head in. Thus, Adam, old and sick, begs his son to go to the cherub before paradise (v. 56).

"Pray him, my son, that he may me acquaint  
 How long I shall the oil of mercy miss,  
 That God himself me promised, as He drove  
 Me forth the garden."

He then gives him, at his request, instructions as to the journey (ver. 69); "he is to follow the path eastward, by which he will come into a valley, called the vale of Ebron, and here he will still see the footmarks made by himself and Eve as they in sorrow took their way from paradise." Seth then comes to the cherub and states to him the request of Adam. The cherub calls him to take a view of paradise, and when he has done this, he will hear his request. Seth puts his head through the gate, casts his eyes round, and sees four rivers, and on the bank a high leafless tree upon which there is a serpent, while upon the top of the tree there is a child lying, newly born, and wrapped in clothes, and whose weeping he hears. Returning from his observation he inquires concerning the child, and receives the following explanation (ver. 184):—

"The child that on the tree's high summit weeps  
To heaven, shall of a virgin pure be born,  
Receiving human shape, without the course  
Of nature, for this is the Son of God.  
And when the years have run their round,  
And reached the destined point of time, then joy  
Shall also visit Adam, not before.  
Forth from the child and from his sufferings th'oil  
Of mercy pressed, in richest streams shall flow  
To Adam, who shall then himself rejoice,—  
His soul disburthened of the grief he brought  
To all the world. But the blood must flow  
Upon the cross that grows from three choice seeds:—  
Go then to Adam, and relate the words  
That thou hast heard. Three days beyond the time  
That thou dost see him he shall live,—no more;  
Begone," etc., etc.

Seth hastens to Adam, and relates to him word for word what the angel hath said to him:—

"That from no tree, but from the child shall come  
The oil of mercy."

The whole narrative has found a wide acceptance in Germany in several forms. First there was a Netherlandish version of this work, made as it appears towards the end of the fourteenth century, at Hamburg, and inserted in the so-called *Harte Book*, a collection of sacred and profane poetry, from which collection it has been recently published. After this, towards the end of the fifteenth century, it was cast into the dramatic form in North Germany, by Arnold Immessen, and found a place in his great Netherlandish Theatre, which comprehends sacred history from the creation to the reception of Mary in the temple.

The passages which have been above quoted, are there reproduced nearly word for word, with slight omissions, and also with additions, especially a monologue, which is put into the mouth of Seth before he enters paradise :—

“ Now are my senses glad, for now I step  
Within the rest of God, the paradise,  
The holy place, which Adam sorrowing left,  
Because that he had sinned : I will mine eyes  
Feast with the sight, for never will they drink  
Such joy as now,” etc., etc.

In a Netherlandish play of the resurrection, which was committed to writing at Wismar, in the year 1464, but which is grounded on an older Low-Rhenish text, the legend is introduced on the stage with dramatic scenery, but in a simpler form, and in immediate connection with the original representation in the so-called gospel of Nicodemus, that the fathers in hell await with expectation the descent of Christ.

Seth says :—

“ My father Adam at the point of death  
Thus spake to me ; Hear me, my son, he says,  
Go straight to paradise and pray to God  
Th’ Almighty that he may accord to thee  
His mercy by his angel ; that by its power  
I may revive again. At his behest  
I went. When to the gate I came, I found  
The angel Michael standing there, who said,  
Seth, cease to weep, thou canst not have the oil.  
Then said he to me, Take this branching twig,  
And set it in the ground, and know that soon  
As years five thousand and five hundred more  
Have run their course then Adam will rejoice  
And all his race.”

The request for oil is here supposed ; the angel instead of it gives him a branch ; it is the other legend, but only glanced at.

3. The legend has also found a place in the works of more modern poets. It has been adopted by Calderon in the *Prophetess of the East* ; but for the tree of life he introduces the tree of death. At the end of the play it is revealed to Solomon by the queen of Sheba, how Adam, to whom the promise of mercy had been made at his expulsion from paradise, drawing near his end, sent Seth for the oil of mercy. Upon his stating his request, the angel points out to him a sign which he should report to his father :<sup>d</sup>—

---

<sup>d</sup> Calderon, *La Sibila del Oriente*. We rather give Calderon's text than the German rendering of it.—Tr.

“ Desde la puerta miró  
 Una vision exquisita  
 En un árbol, cuyas hojas  
 Secas, mustias y marchitas,  
 Desnudo et tronco dejaban,  
 Que, entre nil copas floridas  
 De los árboles, él solo  
 Sin pompa y sin bazarria,  
 Era Cadaver del prado ;  
 Y como todos vivian  
 Con almas, él solamente.  
 Sin alma vegetation,  
 Era un árbol esqueleto,  
 Con la armadura y sin vida.  
 Este el Angel le enseñó  
 Con el dedo, y dijo : mira,  
 El oleo de la piedad.”<sup>e</sup>

When Adam hears this, he gives to his son the dying command to bring him to Hebron.—

“ ————Set ; yo muero ;  
 Lo que mi amor determina,  
 Es, que me des sepultura  
 En Ebron ; y mira encima  
 De mi sepulcro, que un árbol  
 Nace ; que esto significa  
 Ver tú el árbol de la muerte  
 Y cuando árbol de la vida  
 Quieran piadosos los cielos,  
 Que nazca de mis cenizas.”<sup>f</sup>

Goethe in his *Reineke Fuchs*, also makes an allusion to it on occasion of the ring with three Hebrew names, which the fox pretends to have presented to the king :—

“ The three engraven names  
 Were brought by holy Seth from paradise  
 When he the oil of mercy begged.”

III. *Application of the Tree of Life to the Cross of Christ.*—  
 The conception of the cross as a tree of life, very naturally follows from the explanation which makes the tree of life a symbol of Christ, as the cross was the means whereby he brought life to light. And thus far it comes into contrast with the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This, however, is also a tree of death, which limits the relation of the two last. In this reference the inner association has not alone been abided by,

<sup>e</sup> Calderon, *La Sibila del Oriente*, jorn. iii., Esc. 7. Opera Ed. Keil, iii., 217. Aribau, *Bibliot. de Autor. Espan.*, tom. iv.

<sup>f</sup> *La Sibila del Oriente*, Ed. Keil ubi supra, jorn. iii., Esc. 7.

for a material connection has been elicited through a discovery that the wood of the cross was taken from a tree which traced its origin back to the tree of paradise. This legend which first shewed itself in the latter part of the middle ages, has had a wide currency, alongside of the antiquated tradition above adverted to, and is not less a vehicle of symbolical ideas. In order to see how these notions reciprocally limit each other and interweave themselves together, let us review them separately in their historical development.

1. *The Tree of Life as representative of the Cross.*—As far back as the time of Justin Martyr, who, in the middle of the second century, affirms this tree to be a symbol of Christ, we find the endeavour to carry this symbolization through the Old Testament with reference to the cross of Christ, for he proves the significance of "wood," in sacred history, to be that of "branch," "twig," or "tree." "Under a tree God appeared to Abraham at the oak of Mamre; with a staff in his hand Moses divided the sea at the head of his people; by a piece of wood thrown into the bitter waters of Marah he made them sweet; the rod of Aaron which blossomed, betokens him priest; David calls the godly a tree planted by the rivers of water which yields its fruit at its season. As a root out of the stem of Jesse shall the Messiah be born, according to Isaiah." Julius Firmicus Maternus quotes a like number of instances, although without mentioning the tree of life, in order to oppose them to the heathenish use of pieces of wood or trees in their mummeries. "Consider," says he, "the order of the divine and delivering tree. From the deluge man was saved by a wooden ark; upon the shoulders of his only son Abraham laid wood; the people of God, returning from Egypt, were protected by a wooden rod; the bitter waters were made sweet by wood; the healing water was drawn forth from the lifeless rock by a wooden rod; and the law of God was committed to a wooden ark; by all which, as by particular steps, the salvation of man reached to the wood of the cross."<sup>8</sup>

At a later period, Johannes Damascenus, among the Greeks, thus reviews the previous history of the cross. "The tree of

---

<sup>8</sup> The original passage in Maternus is very curious, but we only quote the portion which Dr. Piper has translated: "Divini et liberantis ligni ordinem discite, ut scias nulla tibi posse ratione succurri. De cataclysmo humanum genus arca lignea liberavit. Deinde Abraham ligna unici filii humeris imponit. De Ægypto recedentem populum Dei plebem lignea virga protexit. Lignum dulcem saponem amaræ myrrhæ fontibus reddidit. Lignea virga ex spiritali petra salutaris unda profertur. . . Et lex Dei arcæ lignæ creditur, ut his omnibus quasi per gradus quosdam ad lignum crucis salus hominum perveniret." Jul. Fir. Mat., De Errore Prof. Rel. cap. 27.



life," he says, "planted by God in paradise, was a prefiguration of the precious cross; for, as through wood came death, so also through wood must come life and the resurrection from the dead." He then couples with this the other prefigurations, especially the staff of Moses, by which he divided the sea, and struck the water from the rock; the wood by which he made the bitter waters sweet; and the rod which announced to Aaron the priestly office. And here, above all, the festivals in honour of the crucifixion have given occasion, in the sermons on the cross, to refer to the tree of life, and to place both in parallelism, of which we shall say more hereafter. We may now mention, however, a sermon of Theophanes Cerameus, archbishop of Taormenum in the twelfth century, on the feast of the Elevation of the Cross, in which he explains the tree of life as a prophecy of the cross: "When God, at the creation of the world, planted paradise towards the East, he made the tree of life grow in the middle of Eden, whereby he proclaimed, as if from on high, to all beforehand, In the middle of the earth shall be planted the cross bearing the giver of life." In the Latin middle ages, Thomas Aquinas cites the before-mentioned passage of Julius Firmicus, although naming Augustine as his authority, in a sermon on the passion, in proof that the mode of death by crucifying is consistent with many prefigurations in Scripture.

2. *The Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil, and the Cross of Christ.*—I On the other hand, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil also leads to the cross, partly through an antitype, the basis of which we find in Paul; for the apostle declares that as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous (Rom. v. 19): and of this obedience it is said that Christ exercised it even to the death on the cross (Phil. ii. 8). The disobedience referred to, however, applies to the eating of the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge. In this manner, as instruments of the one and of the other, this tree and that wood stand opposed. This reciprocal image has been employed in the church from the most ancient times. Thus Irenæus first observes: "As we, by the wood, have become debtors to God, so have we, through the wood, received the remission of our debts." Again, in the apocryphal gospel of Nicodemus, after the Redeemer has appeared in Hades, and has freed the prisoners, the personification of Hades says to Satan, who has promised himself so much advantage from his death: "Behold, and see that the dead one is gone from me; what, therefore, thou hast gained through the tree of knowledge, thou hast lost through the tree of the cross; for there thou hast lost all." But

the Lord, after he has led out Adam by the hand, says to the rest, "Come with me, all ye who have died by the tree which this man has touched, for I make you all alive through the tree of the cross." In like manner, also, in the Latin church, Tertullian explains the words which he sets before the Jews, "the tree shall bear its fruit," (Joel ii. 22) thus: "Not that tree in paradise which gave to the first man his death, but the tree of the sufferings of Christ, whereon hung the life on which ye did not believe." So also Julius Firmicus Maternus: "The tree of knowledge conferred on the deceived ones a death-bringing knowledge; the wood of the cross has restored life by an immortal union. Adam despised, Christ obeyed, God; so by the divine ordination Christ has found again what Adam lost." Ambrose, in a contrast of both, says pithily, "Death came by the tree, life by the cross." This contrast is expressed by Augustine, in a sermon on the Lord's sufferings, which has been lately discovered, "On one tree we have suffered woe; on another are we redeemed; on wood has death and life hung suspended." And it is rhetorically enlarged upon in a sermon on Eve and Mary: "As we have been made dead by a tree, so have we been made alive by a tree. A tree discovered to us our nakedness; a tree has covered us with the leaves of mercy; a tree infused into us the scorching heat of sin; a tree has given us cooling from its fatal fires; the tree of knowledge produced to us thorns and thistles; the tree of wisdom has yielded us hope and salvation; a tree brought to us sweat and work; rest and peace are bestowed on us by the tree of the cross, etc."

Then this contrast forms a string of triumphs in the hymns of the church. It is so used, especially by Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, in the second half of the sixth century, in the famous hymn which begins, "*Pange lingua gloriosi Prælium certaminis.*" (Str. ii.)

" De parentis protoplasti  
Fraude Factor condolens,  
Quando pomi noxialis  
In necem morsu ruit:  
Ipse lignum tunc notavit  
Damna ligni ut solveret  
Hoc opus nostræ salutis  
Ordo depoposcerat  
Multiformis proditoris  
Ars ut artem falleret  
Et medelam ferret inde  
Hostis unde læserat."

And so in the middle ages. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, at the beginning of the ninth century, in a poem on the seven mortal

sins, in the course of which he comes to speak of the manner in which vice is conquered by virtue, begins by placing the fall and redemption in contrast: "In this way often, this physician heals by opposites, but sometimes by things like: by a tree came death, and again by a tree came glorious life." In the *Elucidarium* already mentioned, the question is put to the scholar, "Why did Christ die upon a tree? to which the teacher gives the answer, That he might overcome him (the devil) who overcame by the tree, and that he might restore him who fell by the tree." And Thomas Aquinas, in the thirteenth century, in shewing the appropriateness of this kind of death, observes, "This was the fittest as a satisfaction for the sin of the first man," quoting, at the same time, a passage from Augustine: "Adam despised the command, taking fruit of the tree; but what Adam lost, Christ has again recovered at the cross." To this, the author of the *Golden Legend* several times recurs; not only in the section on the Lord's passion, where the above words of Ambrosius are quoted, but in the legend of St. Cecilia, who, to the still heathen Tiburtius, explains the Lord's passion, and its redeeming effect, in a list of parallelisms (*congruitates*), of which the last is, "He hangs upon the tree in order to put away the transgression of the tree."

To a more modern date belongs, in this connection, the beautiful poem of Calderon, the Prophetess of the East, that is, the queen of Sheba, who, full of enthusiasm, writes down her inspiration upon palm-leaves—a prophecy which forms the basis of the whole drama:—

celestial	singular
" Un singular, un celestial madero	
Con dulce fruta en su sazon cogida	
Antidoto	ser primero
Antíroto hade sel de aquel plimero	
Porque uno muserte dé, y otro dé vida	
Y cuando el parasismo vea postrero	
La fábrica del arbe derasida	
	juicio
Con él á juicio universal llamados	
Los di chosos serán los senalados." <sup>a</sup>	

The verses are read off singly from the palm-leaves, and then together; they occur again afterwards, when they are sung to the queen as she rests on Lebanon, under the shadow of this very tree.

2. On the other hand, anticipating this contrast, there comes

<sup>a</sup> *La Sibila del Oriente*, jorn. ii., Esc. 1. Ed. Keil, p. 207, the variations in jorn. i., Esc. 9 and 10, p. 204, are shewn by the words inserted between the lines of text.

in a parallel between the wood of the cross and the tree of knowledge in respect of the curse which follows the eating of the forbidden fruit. For, if through the wounds of the crucified Saviour we are healed (according to the words of Isaiah liii. 5), yet they were inflicted on him when he was on the cross; and if on the cross he freed us from the curse of sin, he has, at the same time, borne this curse himself (according to the words, "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," Gal. iii., 13.) This association of thought has acquired a real expression in a legend which has been in currency since the twelfth century.

*On the derivation of the Wood of the Cross from the Tree of Knowledge.*<sup>1</sup>—As early as 1120, Lambertus, canon of St. Omer, inserted into his collection of poetry the following extract:—

"When Adam was about nine hundred and thirty years old, he declared he should die; but that he must suffer from severe disease until he perceived the smell of the tree whereby he had sinned against God in paradise. And he said to his son Seth, 'Go to the east, to the very brink of the ocean, and call on God with hands stretched out to heaven, and thou wilt perhaps find help in this matter.' When Seth fulfilled the commission of his father, he was transported by the angel into paradise, and after he had broken off a branch from the tree, he was brought back; whereon he returned to his father. Refreshed by the smell of the tree, his father died. Thereon Seth planted the branch, which grew to a tree and stood till the time of Solomon. The chief builders of the temple, when they saw how fine a tree it was, hewed it down; but the builders rejected it like the stone which is become the head of the corner. And it lay there unused for 1090 years, that is, till Christ came. Of this wood was the cross of Christ made."

Petrus Comestor, chancellor of the university of Paris, afterwards canon of St. Victor, gives an account of the tree during this time, without touching on its previous history, in his *Biblical History*, which he composed 1169—1175.

"As we have received from some, the queen of Sheba saw in the spirit in the house of the forest that is called Nethota, the tree of the cross of Christ; and she informed Solomon, after she had left him, that thereon one should die, on account of whose death the Jews would be destroyed as a nation. Solomon, terrified, caused it to be buried where the Sheep

---

<sup>1</sup> The subject has been often mentioned in modern times without coming up regularly for discussion. Münter, *Figures*, ii., p. 46, note 67, remarks, "I think I have somewhere read a myth according to which the wood of Christ's cross was cut from the tree of knowledge of good and evil." Olshausen, *Comment. on the Gospels*, second edition, part ii., p. 481, and Thilo, *Cod. Apocr.*, part i., p. 686, touch on the legend in its latest versions. Menzel, *Christ. Symbol.*, part i., p. 114, refers to an earlier period, and Heider, the Roman church at Schönggrabern, p. 134. The following account is intended to shew the course and the ramifications of the tradition.

Pool, John v. 2, was afterwards made. But when the time came that Christ should suffer, it swam above the water as if announcing Christ, and from this period the movement in the waters (mentioned in the Gospel) began."

Still, the author adds, this is not authentic;—the *Herrad von Landsperg* gives the whole story in her *Hortus Deliciarum*, of the year 1175, in which use is made of the above-mentioned Petrus Comestor; and that from the sending of Seth to paradise to fetch the branch, to the discovery in the sheep pool at Jerusalem of the wood of which the cross of Christ was made. There is only an addition to the effect that the tree which was not used at the building of the temple, was employed in a bridge over a ditch in the city over which the queen of Sheba should have passed; but, warned by a presentiment she refused, and worshipped. The very same account is given by John Beleth (about 1182), in commenting upon the feast of the elevation of the cross. In this shape it passed into the thirteenth century. Gervasius of Tilbury inserted the passage from Petrus Comestor in his *Imperial Leisure Hours* (about the year 1211); he adds, however, a second legend: "According to the Greeks a branch was brought to Jerusalem from the tree by which Adam sinned, and from this the cross comes, that by the same wood by which came death might come also redemption." All these traditions were brought together in the second half of this century by Jacobus à Voragine, who cites them at the festival of the discovery of the cross, inasmuch as the wood of the cross had already been found by Seth in paradise, by Solomon in Lebanon, by the queen of Sheba in the temple of Solomon, and by the Jews in the sheep pool. After he gives, from the gospel of Nicodemus, the tradition of the sending of Seth to the tree of mercy, he remarks farther:—

"We read in another place, that the angel gave him a branch with directions to plant it in Lebanon. In a history of the Greeks, however, which is apocryphal, it is said, 'The angel gave him of the wood by which Adam sinned, telling him that when it bore fruit his father would become well. On his return, finding him dead, he planted a branch on his grave, which grew to a great tree, and lasted till the time of Solomon.'"

Whether this be true or not, he leaves to the judgment of the reader, as it appears not in any authentic chronicle or history; while in another place he expresses himself strongly against the truth of it. He farther reports the felling of the tree by Solomon, quoting John Beleth, and remarks that he never could understand why the builders rejected it and made of it a bridge over a pool. Farther on he speaks of the queen of Sheba, that she never walked on the wood, but immediately worshipped,

and what she then announced to Solomon, besides other particulars as related by Petrus Comestor.

Some versions of the legend, somewhat different from the above, are to be met with at the end of the twelfth and in the course of the thirteenth century. One of these is by Godfridus of Viterbo in his chronicle (about 186), who, quoting Athanasius, reports:—

“Hiontus (or rather *Ionicus*), one of the two sons of Noah, whom he begat after the deluge, when he heard of the glory of paradise that had been lost, prayed the Lord that he would shew it to him. In a trance he was carried to paradise, but did not know whether he was in the body or out of the body: to ascertain this, he took three plants with him,—a fir, a palm, and a cypress,—which he planted in different places. But they came together, and grew into one tree with threefold leaves. This tree was well known when David ordered wood to be hewn for the temple on Mount Lebanon, and he had the tree brought into his chamber; but Solomon in vain tried to use it in the building of the temple.”

And then follows the rest mainly as it is in Petrus Comestor. Thus the reference to the tree of paradise is here given up. But it reappears in two traditions of the thirteenth century, and of French origin. The one occurs in a narrative respecting the repentance of Adam, which was translated by one Andreas from the Latin into the French: according to this, Eve along with the forbidden fruit, broke off a branch from the tree of knowledge, which she in her distraction of spirit brought with her from paradise. Struck into the ground by her it grew to a great tree, under which Abel was killed. At a later time it was used in the building of the most holy place in the temple of Solomon, and finally it yielded the beams out of which the cross was made. The other legend is contained in an old French poem by the priest Herman of Valenciennes: according to it, after the fall of Adam, God rooted out the tree of knowledge, and cast it over the wall of paradise. A thousand years after it was found by Abraham, who planted it in his garden, on which a voice from heaven announced to him that this was the tree on the wood of which the Redeemer should be crucified.

Following the development of the legend of the derivation of this wood from paradise, we find it adopted and much used in the German poetry of the thirteenth century. First, by Henry of Meissen (*Frauenlob*), who in his *Body of the Cross* mentions how Adam in his sickness sent his son to paradise,

“ . . . seeking food  
Which might yield eternal good,”

and how the branch which he obtained was planted on the grave

of Adam, who had meanwhile died. From this came the stem of the cross, as the Sibyl mentions; then the will of Solomon tendered it its right. Finally,

“The cross bore Christ, who as the door of heaven  
Gives us our entrance, the Eternal Word,  
Which like an arrow from the soul of God  
Doth pierce us, giving life for death.”

Also in his *Body of Mary*, Frauenlob briefly develops the oneness of the tree from paradise and that of the cross, whereat he calls God the “ancient gardener,” because he planted the garden in Eden.

“ . . . He was the ancient gardener<sup>1</sup>  
Who the tree planted, on whose fruit he waits,  
When death into the world had come.”

Farther, in the poem of the Sibyl’s prophecy, of the middle of the fourteenth century, which consists of a dialogue between the Sibyl and king Solomon, it gives a particular account of the hope entertained by the sick and aged Adam that he should recover. Thus he entreats:—

“ — his first-born son that he would go  
And see if any one might enter in,  
So that he might the precious fruit obtain  
Which should restore his strength.”

The son, making signs of willing obedience, went on his journey to paradise. When he came to the gate, an angel stood there with a branch in his hand bearing many kinds of fruit, and asked him what he wanted. The young man mentions the fruit of paradise, by eating which his father might recover and be secure against death; on which the angel answers,—

“Receive this branch young man,  
And take it to thy father who by God  
And the wood’s blessing will to health return,  
And live for ever.”

Seth understood not this; he thought his father should be restored to health on earth and never die: but when on his return he found him already buried, he wept much, and planting the branch on the grave, he thought—

“Perhaps he thereby might return to life,  
And die no more.”

Here this section ends. In an appendix in manuscript, it is related that the wood was sunk by Solomon in the pool of

---

<sup>1</sup> Dante calls God the *Ortolano eterno*, par. xxvi. 65.

Siloam after the departure of the queen of Sheba, but that on Good Friday it came forth from the pool in the form of a cross, and was used at the crucifixion.

In this form the legend has been adopted in the first of the Mystery-plays of the seven joys of Mary, called *Die eerste bliscap van Maria*, which was performed in the year 1444, by Rederykern of Brussels. Seth sent by Adam to paradise, to inquire of the angel when he should recover from his sickness. He is told,—by the tree whereby Adam sinned he shall receive peace; while he is at the same time instructed to plant a branch which is broken off for him, on the grave of his father (who has in the meantime died), out of this a greater and more beautiful tree will arise, which will bring him restoration from his misery. This is then the branch, which was merely adverted to in the Netherlandish play of the year 1464 above mentioned. On the other hand again, it is more plainly spoken of in the French mystery-play of the fifteenth century also noticed above; here Seth receives the branch from God, with the explanation that it is from the apple-tree of which his father eat: and with the command to plant it above his grave, and over his body after his death.

Finally, there is another version of the legend in the poem of James of Maerlant, at the end of the thirteenth century, of which we have already made use in speaking of the oil of mercy. According to this, the angel does not give to Seth a branch, but three seeds from an apple taken from the branch wherefrom his father eat; which seeds are to be placed beneath his tongue as he lies in his grave in the valley of Hebron (v. 211—217, 229); from these there spring three shoots, a cedar, a cypress, and a palm (v. 236). Moses finds them there, and recognizes therein a sign of the Divine Trinity (v. 330), as already the angel had intimated to Seth; by a divine impulse he takes them out and makes with them the waters of Marah sweet, takes them with him, and finally places them in Moab in the earth. With these David planted his farm, having received instructions from the angel to this effect (v. 387—398):—

“Therefrom a tree shall grow, whereon shall die  
The One who shall redeem what Adam lost.”

A further account is then given of the manner in which, under Solomon, the tree was felled for the building of the temple, but which in no shape would fit, and which lay unused in the temple; then was used as a bridge; but after the queen of Sheba had informed him of the destination of this wood, it was brought back into the temple with honour. Under king Abia it



was again brought out, and buried by the Jews in the place where afterwards the Sheep Pool was made, and so the legend goes on according to the earlier traditions.

This story of the derivation of the wood of the cross, is also found word for word in the play entitled "The Fall," by Arnold Immessen. The cherub, while announcing to Seth the future redemption of Adam by the blood of Christ, passes over to the wood of the cross (v. 1479).

"Forth from three seeds this wood shall spring;  
Ta'en from an apple, growing on the branch  
Of which eat Adam when Eve plucked the fruit  
Forbidden by the Lord."

He then gives him the three seeds, telling him that as Adam in the course of three days will die, "The three seeds which I give to thee thou shalt lay in the same hour under his tongue in his mouth, and bury them with him in the ground, and from them shall spring three rods;" the one a cedar, the second a cypress, the third an olive-tree, which have reference to God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This Seth tells to Adam, and does accordingly (v. 1576 and 1667).

The same tradition is found in a French version of the life and repentance of Adam; concerning Seth's journey to paradise to fetch the oil of mercy, the form of the tree of knowledge, the three apple seeds which he receives from the angel to place in Adam's mouth, and from which three trees of different kinds spring forth, and their final application to the cross of Christ. The Latin original of this *Repentance of Adam*, which differs in this from the above-mentioned, was several times printed at the end of the fifteenth century.

Calderon has adopted a new modification of the legend which however in other respects he follows, in his drama entitled, *The Prophetess of the East*, of which the story of the wood of the cross forms the hinge on which the interest of the drama turns. He ignores the connection between the tree of paradise and the wood of the cross; but delivers a twofold tradition concerning the derivation of the latter. At first he appears to bring into connection the saying of Adam, concerning a tree which should grow over his grave, when the information is communicated, which from the oldest times had been perpetuated by the dwellers in Mount Lebanon:—

"Tradicion es verdadera  
De los moradores rudos  
Del Libano, que este tronco  
De Ebron á sus montes trujo

Jerico, de Noé hijo,  
 Que fue el que en herencia tuvo  
 Esta parte, cuando él  
 Partió entre los hijos suyos  
 La tierra la vez segunda  
 Que volvió á nacer el mundo.<sup>k</sup>

Afterwards however he is diverted from this by the olive-branch which the dove brought to Noah in the ark, and with reference to the announcement above-mentioned made by the queen of Sheba:—

“En el Libano le puso  
 Y como cosa divina  
 Los siglos le veneraron  
 Y los hombres le acreditan  
 Por palma, cedro y cipres.”<sup>l</sup>

This is the tree beneath which the queen of Sheba rests before she comes to Solomon. Here the well-known incidents are brought into connection; the felling of the tree for the building of the temple, when the threefold nature of the tree is declared, explained; its not fitting to the temple, its lying in the garden, and its being afterwards employed to form a bridge over the brook Kedron. But when Solomon would conduct the queen across the bridge, she starts back affrighted, and then reveals the secret of its past history and its future destination:—

“Y así no admires, que sobre  
 Hoy á tu fábrica rica,  
 Si para templo mejor  
 Le guarda el cielo, y destina;  
 Pues ya parece que veo,  
 Que sobre su cuello estriba  
 Otra fábrica mas bella,  
 Que ha de ser fábrica viva.”<sup>m</sup>

In which the crucified Redeemer is depicted.

(3). *The Cross as the Tree of Life.*—Thus the thoughts which paradise awakens, whether in respect of death or life, meet as at a common point of attraction in the cross of Christ. But without reference to the paradisaical type, we see them both in the cross, since the Redeemer died on it and conquered death. Also for the redeemed, who obtain through his death eternal life; the cross is not only a sign of death but also of life. And in this way it is celebrated in hymns and in homilies, as the very wood or tree of life.

<sup>k</sup> *La Sibila del Or.*, jorn. ii., Esc. 2. Ed. Keil, iii. 209.

<sup>l</sup> *Sibila del Oriente*, jorn. iii., Esc. 7. Ed. Keil, iii. 217.

<sup>m</sup> *Sib. del Or.*, jorn. iii., Esc. 7. Ed. Keil, iii. 217.

(1). This name is associated with the real cross of Christ, said to have been discovered in the fourth century, and appears primarily in a series of monuments in the Grecian church. In the second half of that century lived Macrina, sister of Gregory of Nyssa, who in her biography writes of her; there was found on her dead body an iron ring, which she constantly wore at her heart; it was broken, and contained, it is said, "a piece of the wood of life," the sign of the cross being engraven on its outside. The name is found also in the Greek inscriptions of several precious crosses which were erected by the later Byzantine emperors. One of these, from the first half of the tenth century, at present in Weilburg, contains a dedication by the emperors Constantine VII., Porphyrogenitus, and Romanus I., Lecapenus, which thus begins,—“God has stretched out his hands on the tree of life, and through it has displayed his power.” Another, from the first half of the twelfth century, at present in Venice, is dedicated to the Redeemer by the empress Irene Ducæne, consort of the emperor Alexius Comnenus, when she was near her death, according to the inscription, which thus begins,—“And this I bring to thee at length, now approaching the gates of the underworld, as a holy consecration gift, the wood of life, on which thou didst resign thy spirit to the Father, and ended thy pains which thou didst patiently endure.”

This name for the cross appears in the Greek Church particularly, also on occasion of the festivals of the cross, not only with a reference to the tree of life of paradise, as we have seen, but with allusion to the first Psalm, according to which, in an oration on the festival of the elevation of the cross, delivered by Andreas Cretensis, the cross is called a tree planted by the rivers of water; what water?—the Scriptures inspired by God, which are a tree of life to all who lay hold on them, as wisdom is called (Prov. iii. 18). The same Andreas terms the cross the tree of immortality (*φυτὸν* and *ξύλον ἀθανασίας*); and the life-giving tree (*ζωηρὸν ξύλον*). It is also called the root of life, in a sermon on the same festival by Joseph, archbishop of Thessalonica. Accordingly, its general name is equivalent to life-giving (*ζωοποιὸς*) in the heading of these festival sermons (*περὶ τοῦ τιμίου καὶ ζωοποιοῦ σταυροῦ*); and frequently in the text itself, also life-giving (*ζωοπάροχος* and *ζωοδότης*); and life-bringing (*ζωηφόρος*), in the same sense as it is called saving or salvation-bringing.

(2). In the Latin Church, the cross has also been celebrated in this sense in the hymns of ancient Christianity. In one of these, probably composed by the grammarian Victorinus in the

second half of the fourth century, and which has even been attributed to Cyprian, the cross is described as a tree, and Christ himself as the tree of life; the last as follows :—

“ In very centre of the earth there lies  
A place called Golgotha in the Hebrew tongue,  
Where, as I do remember, once there grew  
A tree hewn from a barren oak, which bore  
To mankind precious fruit, but it did yield  
None to the gardeners who did plant it, for  
A foreign race the blessed harvest reaped.  
This tree has but a single stem, and spreads  
Its branches out in even lines . . .  
Him that it bore as fruit, the earth received  
In her dark bosom, when he felt but soon  
As dawned, the light on the third day, behold,  
O great amaze, to heaven and earth he sprang  
Forth from the tomb, a living glorious branch,  
Bearing the fruit of life.”

The above-mentioned hymn of Fortunatus (*Pange Lingua*) near the end contains these lines :—

“ Crux fidelis inter omnes arbor una nobilis  
Silva taleu nulla profert fronde, flore, germine  
Dulce ferrum, dulce lignum, dulce pondus sustinent.

“ Flecte ramos arbor alta, tensa laxa viscera,  
Et rigor lentescat ille quem dedit nativitas,  
Et superni membra regis tende miti stipite.

“ Sola digna tu fuisti ferre mundi victimam,  
Atque portum preparare arca mundo naufrago  
Quem sacer cruor perunxit fusus Agni corpore.”

In like manner, in the middle ages. There is a hymn composed in praise of the cross, by Adam of St. Victor, in the twelfth century (*Laudes crucis attollamus*), the twelfth verse of which is :—

“ O crux, lignum triumphale  
Vera mundi salus, vale,  
Inter ligna nullum tale.  
Fronde, flore, germine :  
Medicina christiana  
Salva sanos, ægros sana,  
Quod non valet vis humana  
Fit in tuo nomine.”

Then the hymn of Bonaventura in the thirteenth finds its

\* Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnol.*, i., 161.

° *Ibid.*, ii., 79.

proper place, to which however we shall return when we come to speak of the monuments.<sup>p</sup>

---

<sup>p</sup> The following seems worth insertion here:—

“Vexilla regis prodeunt,  
Fulget crucis mysterium,  
Qua vita mortem pertulit,  
Et morte vitam protulit.

“Impleta sunt quæ concinit  
David fideli carmine,  
Dicendo nationibus:  
Regnavit a ligno Deus.

“Arbor decora, et fulgida,  
Ornata regis purpura,  
Electa digno stipite,  
Tam sancta membra tangere,” etc.—*Tr.*

---

The Bible, I say the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants. Whatsoever else they beleeve besides it, and the plaine irrefragible, indubitable consequences of it, well may they behold it as a matter of opinion, but as matter of faith and religion, neither can they with coherence to their own grounds beleeve it themselves, nor require the belief of it of others, without most high and most schismaticall presumption. I for my part, adds he, after a long (and as I verily beleeve and hope) impartiall search of the true way to eternall happiness, doe professe plainly that I cannot find any rest for the sole of my foot, but upon this rock only. I see plainly and with mine own eyes, that there are popes against popes, councells against councells, some fathers against others, the same fathers against themselves, a consent of fathers of one age against a consent of fathers of another age, the church of one age against the church of another age. Traditive interpretations of Scriptures are pretended, but there are few or none to be found; no tradition but only of Scripture, can derive itself from the fountaine, but may be plainly prov'd either to have been brought in, in such an age after Christ; or that in such an age it was not in. In a word, there is no sufficient certaintie but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This therefore, and this only I have reason to beleeve; this I will professe, according to this I will live, and for this I will not only willingly, but even gladly loose my life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I beleeve it or no, and seeme it never so incomprehensible to humane reason, I will subscribe it hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this, God hath said so, therefore it is true. In other things I will take no man's libertie of judgment from him; neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse man, nor the worse Christian. I will love no man the lesse, for differing in opinion with me. And what measure I meet to others I expect from them againe. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore that men out not to require any more of any man, than this, to beleeve the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to finde the true sense of it, and to live according to it.—*William Chillingworth.*

**THE PARABLE OF THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.\*****IV.**

THE difficulties involved in the parable of Dives and Lazarus have been most ably stated by your correspondent, Mr. Flower. There are few persons who have attempted to expound this parable who have not felt the difficulty of giving a perfectly satisfactory explanation of it. Is the conclusion to which Mr. Flower evidently tends, that the parable was not uttered by our Lord, a necessary inference from the difficulties in question? Without maintaining that the whole of them are entirely removed by the following remarks, I commend them to Mr. Flower's attention, as it is evident that some portion of the case has escaped his observation. I will therefore discuss his reasoning in the order in which it is presented by him.

It must be admitted that a few passages have crept into the text of the Scriptures which never were written by the authors of the inspired books. It is therefore conceivable that this parable may have been introduced into St. Luke's Gospel in a similar way, if the internal evidence against it affords conclusive proof that it could not have been uttered by our Lord. The other passages of doubtful authenticity are wanting in some of the manuscripts. But if this passage must be rejected, it must be pronounced to be an interpolation entirely on internal evidence. It will also readily be admitted that the parable, as it stands in our present copies of St. Luke's Gospel, contains no words which directly attribute it to our Lord. But I cannot admit that the connection between Luke xvi. 18 and Luke xvii. would be equally good if the parable were expunged.

At the opening of Luke xvii. our Lord warns the disciples of the sin of placing stumbling-blocks in the way of others. The point of transition from the parable to the warning given to the disciples is evidently contained in the parable itself. Dives had been a stumbling-block to his five brethren. He dreaded their arrival in Hades in an unrepentant state. He therefore wished Lazarus to be sent to them to testify unto them lest they also came to that place of torment.

Now it is a most mysterious dispensation of Divine Providence, that one man should be a stumbling-block to another, and a means of occasioning him to fall into sin, which sin he would have avoided but for his evil example. Our Lord in the beginning of Luke xvii. said that the existence of such stumbling-blocks was part of the appointed order of God's moral govern-

---

\* See *J. S. L.*, Vol. V., pp. 126—132, 290—309.

ment of the world. But although it is the purpose of God that such stumbling-blocks should exist, it does not diminish the responsibility, or the sin of those who are the immediate causes of them. Now, as Dives had been a stumbling-block to his five brethren, nothing is more natural than that this solemn warning should follow the parable and be suggested by it.

It must be conceded that there is a great difference between the structure of this parable and the apparatus employed in it, and that of the other parables unquestionably spoken by our Lord. Now is this difference so great as to afford sufficient evidence that this parable could not have been uttered by him?

I quite agree with Mr. Flower that we are not at liberty to make a new Gospel for ourselves by surmising or suggesting additional circumstances to aid us in our interpretations. To expound our Lord's parables, we have no right to assume the existence of anything which is not expressly stated or implied in them. Nothing would be a greater reflection on our Lord's divine character, than to suppose that he did not embody in his parables everything necessary for conveying the truth which he designed to teach. To assume the existence of circumstances not in the parables is to assert that they are capable of improvement.

But Mr. Flower considers that the parable, accurately interpreted, teaches compensation and retribution, and nothing else; that it represents Dives as miserable in Hades on account of the wealth which he enjoyed in this life, and Lazarus happy as a compensation for his sufferings endured here. If such is the unquestionable teaching of the parable, no amount of manuscript authority will avail to prove that it was ever uttered by the great Teacher come from God.

But as in ascertaining their true meaning we are not at liberty to introduce any fresh circumstance into our Lord's parables which he did not utter, or positively imply, so we must not omit any circumstance actually mentioned by him. This parable is not only absolutely unique in the apparatus which it employs, but it possesses another circumstance, which distinguishes it from our Lord's other parables. To one of the actors in it it assigns a name.

Now, our Lord has never introduced a name into any other parable uttered by him. In this parable, while the rich man is nameless, the beggar's name is explicitly given, "There was a certain beggar *named Lazarus.*" Unless there was a special reason why the beggar should have a name, the parable might as well have run thus: "There was a certain rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar who was laid at his

gate full of sores." As this is the only parable in which a name is introduced, we may conclude that the name itself forms a part of the apparatus of the parable, and that the parable can only be correctly interpreted by a distinct reference to the meaning of the name given to the beggar.

Now the word Lazarus means "God a help." If, therefore, the name Lazarus is part of the apparatus of the parable, it contains the key to its right interpretation. Our Lord might as well have given him any other name; but he has given him a name appropriate to the sense of the parable. When a fictitious name with an appropriate signification is thus assumed, it is equivalent to saying that the beggar's character corresponded with his name. This will enable us to expound the parable without the necessity of introducing any matter or supposition not contained or implied in the parable itself. The parable will then run: "There was a certain rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen, and who fared sumptuously every day; and there was a certain beggar named *God is my help*, who was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. Moreover, the dogs came and licked his sores."

What then does the parable assert or expressly imply respecting the character of the rich man and the beggar? Is the character of the beggar, as Mr. Flower thinks, without a single moral element? His name contains the moral element in his character. He was one who, amidst all the trials and miseries of life, put his trust in God. But what respecting the character of Dives? Is it that of a blameless rich man? It is quite true that the parable does not assert that the character of Dives was morally worse than that of other worldly-minded rich men. He did what other rich men do. He ate and drank everything that was good, and clothed himself magnificently. In this there was no sin. Many religious men, whom God has blessed with the means, have done the same. It is a duty of those whom God has blessed with wealth to furnish employment by a liberal expenditure on articles of luxury. But we must not allow ourselves to contemplate Dives apart from the picture of the beggar lying at his gate. He was full of sores. He was desirous of being fed by the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table. This fare Lazarus most probably obtained, for this seems to be implied in the request of Dives for Lazarus to be sent to dip the tip of his finger in water to cool his tongue. The rich man seems to say, As in my day of life I gave an inconsiderable favour which cost me nothing, so now in my day of suffering I crave of Lazarus a favour even less, a drop of



water from the tip of his finger to cool my tongue. The gift of the crumbs appears, therefore, to have been conceded to Lazarus, but with the same carelessness and indifference as a rich man might throw a penny to a passing beggar. Dives was not disturbed in his enjoyments by the beggar's sufferings, nor made any effort to relieve them. But there is another circumstance in the parable which gives an additional touch to the rich man's character, and somewhat distinguishes it from common worldliness. "The dogs came and licked his sores." Dives, living in abundance, could easily have procured the means of having the beggar's sores dressed. But he resembled the priest and the Levite, and although Lazarus was at his gate, must have carelessly passed by on the other side, and could not have his pleasures interrupted by so sickening a sight. What he failed to do the providence of God got done in another way, not by the ministry of men, but by the aid of an unclean beast. The dogs performed the office of dressing the beggar's sores.

If then the character of Lazarus corresponds with his name, the parable does not represent the condition of Dives and Lazarus in the other world as simply dependant on their wealth or poverty in this world, but as the result of their moral character under the government of a righteous God. The beggar is represented as a man who trusted in God, notwithstanding the pressure of the deepest poverty, exasperated by the presence of a loathsome disease. Dives is depicted as a man devoted to worldly enjoyments, who was ready to throw a careless relief to the beggar, but who would not put himself in the smallest degree out of the way to relieve his misery, who, instead of providing a plaister for the beggar, left the office of dressing his sores to be performed by the dogs. The portrait of Dives is that of a man devoid of all sense of moral obligation.

But the concluding observations which are put into the mouth of Dives make it evident that he felt that there was a moral element in his sufferings. He says, respecting his brethren, "If one went unto them from the dead, they would repent." But of what would they repent? Not surely of being rich, for the expression used by the Evangelist implies a change of heart and character. The repentance spoken of must, therefore, be a forsaking of that spirit of worldliness with which they had been animated. Abraham, in allusion to their repentance, uses the words, "Neither will they be persuaded." But of what would they not be persuaded? Not surely that the possession of wealth will inevitably superinduce suffering in the unseen world, or that the endurance of poverty will be compensated by enjoyment; but that they will not be persuaded of the reality of the

solemn truths written by Moses and the prophets. Of these truths Dives felt that he had not been persuaded during his day of life, though now, in Hades, he had awful experience of their reality.

Mr. Flower considers that Abraham's answer to Dives is a direct negative to the idea, that the moral character of the parties had anything to do with their respective conditions in the unseen world. But in interpreting a parable we have no right to divorce a passage from its context, and say that it must have a particular meaning apart from all considerations derived from other portions of the parable.

After the exordium, in which I maintain that a moral character is assigned to Dives and Lazarus, the parable proceeds, "And it came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom. The rich man also died and was buried."

The burial of Dives is mentioned obviously for the purpose of shewing that he had attained to everything in this world which wealth can give. He had eaten and drank of all that was good, clothed himself gorgeously, and obtained the honours of a suitable funeral; the attainment of all that a man can desire whose motto is, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The beggar died also, after having suffered the extremest ills of life, and so both passed off from this earthly scene.

We now come to the apparatus of the parable derived from the unseen world. Mr. Flower is of opinion that the existence of such an apparatus is a strong objection to the belief that the parable was really uttered by our Lord. The passage is unquestionably the only one in the New Testament, whether it be parable or reality, where a seeming attempt is made to withdraw that curtain which intercepts our view of the realities of the world beyond the grave.

But before we can infer from this circumstance that the parable could not have been uttered by our Lord, we must prove that the use of the imagery in question is inconsistent with the purposes of the Gospel revelation, or that it is not adapted for teaching the spiritual truths designed to be set forth by the parable. Now there are two actions of our Lord recorded by the evangelists, which, when compared with his other actions, are quite as unique as the preternatural imagery employed in this parable—the destruction of the swine, and the cursing of the barren fig-tree. Are we on this account to deny that our Lord performed them? The next question at issue is, not is the imagery unique, but is it well adapted to convey the truth intended to be inferred? Could the same truths have been pour-

trayed by imagery derived from those representations of common life, in which our Lord's other parables are couched.

Mr. Flower also considers that it is a difficulty that both Dives and Lazarus are invested in Hades with the attributes of the flesh, and draws the conclusion that they are represented as having entered on their final state of retribution, which is contrary to the statements of other Scriptures. But the investing them with corporeal form is a necessity of the parabolic representation, and was absolutely required, if any intelligible thought was to be conveyed to the human mind. But not one word is asserted as to whether Dives or Lazarus had entered on a final state of happiness or misery. On the contrary, the language applied to the happiness of Lazarus implies that he had not yet entered on the fulness of joy. Unless we suppose that the departed must exist in a state of insensibility, the parable does not contain one word inconsistent with those assertions of our Lord, that man's final condition will be determined by him hereafter. It only asserts, respecting Dives, that his condition (whatever it was) did not admit of being relieved through the good will of any subordinate agent.

After death then, perhaps while his funeral is being celebrated with all solemnity, Dives, in Hades, is represented as lifting up his eyes in torment, and seeing Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. With the feelings of a genuine Jew, who could not believe that Abraham would suffer any of his descendants to enter the world of woe, he cries out, "Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus to dip the tip of his finger in water to cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame." Dives, therefore, is represented in conformity with Jewish feelings, even in Hades, as addressing Abraham as father, and as looking up to him for relief. It is remarkable that this parable does not represent him as praying Abraham to deliver him from his sufferings, but only to afford him a slight alleviation. This seems like an admission that there was moral justice in his condition. He supplicates for some return from Lazarus for what he had received on earth, but certainly for less than he had given.

Abraham's reply may be understood ironically. Dives, trusting to his fleshy descent, has invoked him as father, and asked his pity. Abraham, although he addresses him as son, implies no feeling of parental fondness. "Remember," says he, "the difference of your states on earth. You received your good things; but he who made God his trust, evil things." What were these evil things? Destitution, a loathsome disease, none but the unclean dogs to dress the beggars sores, even while lying at the rich man's gate. Is there no moral element

here? Would not Dives quite understand the reference? "Remember," says Abraham, "how you enjoyed in life your good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things. Now he is comforted, and you are tormented." Would not the recollection of Dives naturally recur to his own pomp and luxury, and himself passing his gate and beholding the ulcerated beggar, destitute of a plaister, neglected by him, but licked by the dogs.

Mr. F. does not attach much weight to the objection, that there are two reasons given why Dives could not obtain the alleviation which he sought. But the second reason, as it stands in the parable, is a very important one, because it becomes the means of introducing a very considerable portion of the moral which the parable has in view. It distinctly points out that there was a divine decree, which rendered it impossible that the condition of Dives could be alleviated by any means at Abraham's command. If, therefore, it is the object of the parable to teach that while the means of grace are sufficient in this life, they are insufficient in the state beyond the grave, the assertion that there was an impassable gulf, intercepting all communication between Abraham and Dives, is not a mere second reason, but an important and integral portion of the parable.

What, then, is the spiritual truth which is intended to be taught by the parable? Mr. Flower can see none, except a doctrine of compensation or retribution in the other world for what has been enjoyed or suffered in this. It seems to me that it is designed to teach four truths highly important to be known by man; first, that although a worldly-minded man, who lives without a sense of duty, may have a great amount of enjoyment in this world, and that a God-trusting man may suffer the last extremities of poverty and disease, that after death the one enters on a state of retribution and the other of happiness; secondly, that the consequences of worldliness, and living without a sense of responsibility, and in utter selfishness, are such that they are utterly irremediable by any help which can be afforded by one creature to another, and are beyond the reach of the means of grace; thirdly, that the means of grace are sufficient, as long as men continue in this world, to work in them repentance and conversion; fourthly, that no other motives which can be applied to the human heart, beyond those discovered by divine revelation, are adequate for that purpose.

The last portion of the parable is particularly important, and is levelled against the strongest delusions of human nature, that there are other means which are powerful to awaken repentance in the human mind beyond careful attention to the solemn warnings of revelation, especially some extraordinary or miracu-

lous agency. Our Lord himself was in the habit of constantly encountering the delusion with which the minds of his opponents were deeply shrouded, that they would believe in his divine mission if he would produce a different kind of miraculous testimony. Our Lord's opponents mistook the grounds of unbelief, asserting that they were intellectual, and not moral. In opposition to this view, it is the purpose of the concluding portion of the parable to assert that the groundwork of unbelief is essentially moral. To effect this, the strongest imagery is employed in the parable, "I pray thee, therefore, father," Dives is represented as saying, "that thou wilt send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment." Nothing is at first sight more natural than the idea that if a spirit came from the unseen world, and testified of all its realities, that it would awaken men to repentance and faith. Abraham's reply is, They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them, *i. e.*, they possess God's revelation on these subjects: let them attend to them and it. Abraham here asserts the sufficiency of that revelation to lead men to repentance. "Nay," says Dives, re-echoing the strongest feelings of human nature, "if one went unto them from the dead, they would repent." "No," repeats Abraham, "if they hear not Moses and the prophets, they will not be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." If God's revelation does not produce conversion of heart, the unfolding of the secrets of the unseen world would be powerless to create it.

Is there here no great moral and spiritual truth worthy of the teacher come from God? Perhaps there is hardly one which human reason would have been more impotent to discover in the whole pages of revelation. The belief that some extraordinary miraculous intervention, or a disclosure of the secrets of the unseen world, would awaken men's attention to the great truths of religion, and enforce them on their practice, is the root of all self-delusion. No, teaches our Lord, not even if a spirit were to pass from the unseen world and testify of its realities, would it move the unbeliever to repentance or faith. Nothing can effect that great change but the discovery of the divine character contained in his revelation.

I have already disposed of the supposed want of connection between the parable and the following discourse of our Lord. I think it may be shewn to be not altogether unconnected with the preceding admonitions delivered to the Pharisees. It is perfectly true that the Pharisees were covetous, and not thoughtless spendthrifts. Nor is there one word in the parable to imply that Dives was a spendthrift. All that is asserted is that he

lived liberally. A man who is disposed to live liberally, and is intensely fond of worldly enjoyment, will naturally be covetous, because increased wealth will give him increased means of expenditure. The number of misers, *i. e.*, of those who love money for its own sake, and not for the power or the enjoyments which it can procure, is small. The great majority of those who are covetous, at least profess not to desire money simply for the purpose of hoarding, but as a means of procuring the enjoyments of life. The Pharisees, then, like all large bodies of avaricious men, must have professed to desire money not for the mere love of money, but for the sake of what it will command. Our Lord may well have spoken this parable against the Pharisees, not to condemn avarice in the perverted form in which it exists in the miser, but for the purpose of shewing to what end avarice and unconscious disregard of duty conduct at last, when they have attained the very end which they profess to seek, the height of earthly enjoyment, which wealth and careless disregard of others can bestow—a burial for the body, while the soul is miserable in Hades,—a moral condition in the unseen world which is inaccessible to the means of grace. From such a state it is vain to hope for deliverance, except by attending to the motives and warnings disclosed by Revelation. To teach such truths to man is worthy of the teacher come from God.

C. A. Row.

---

V.

ALTHOUGH I cannot agree with Mr. Flower in his view of the non-genuineness of this parable, yet I cannot but think a great many of his remarks upon interpreters and commentators very just, and I fear that some of those who have written in reply to him have laid themselves open to animadversion, and even ridicule from persons inclined to scoff. Two of them have construed the dogs licking the sores of Lazarus into an act of kindness on the part of the dogs, and contrasted it with the cold neglect exhibited by the rich man. For my own part, having considerable doubts as to the beneficial effects of a dog's tongue upon ulcerated sores, and being of opinion that the mention of the dogs was simply intended to exhibit the utter helplessness and misery of Lazarus, who was so weak and diseased as to be unable to prevent them from licking, and thus aggravating his sores, I carried the question to a medical friend. His response was simply a hearty burst of laughter at the idea of the dogs thus performing a kind action to the poor beggar, and he fully corroborated my opinion, that Lazarus would never have allowed them to touch his sores had he been able to drive them away.

It must also be remembered, that dogs are never spoken of in the Scriptures as the companions and friends of man. Tobit's dog is the only dog thus treated in the whole range of early Jewish literature. Unless we lay great stress on the dogs under their master's table of Matt. xv. 27, where the status of the dogs is somewhat doubtful. When not used as watch-dogs, dogs appear to have acted, in a half savage state, as the scavengers of towns, and such were apparently the dainty animals to whose tongues and insults the sores of Lazarus were exposed. Thus the mention of the dogs licking his sores would be a designed contrast to the "sumptuous fare" of the rich man.

In the next place, it is justly observed by Mr. Flower, that it is nowhere stated or even implied that the rich man did not grant the prayer of Lazarus, and allow him the pieces of bread used as finger-napkins between the courses, and other things that fell from his table. The simple fact is, that it is not stated *why* the rich man was condemned, and the poor man exalted in the next life. It is simply said, that each of them had received in full (*ἀπολαμβάνειν*) his good and evil things respectively, whence it may fairly be inferred, that good reasons, whatever they were, existed for the distinction afterwards made between them.

Thirdly, the question, whether this parable was an adaptation of an existing and current fiction, or whether it contains an actual revelation as to the future state, has not been elucidated, and it is very doubtful whether it can be, unless further information as to the literature of the Jews in our Lord's earthly lifetime be obtained. But if it can be shewn that the expression, "Abraham's bosom," was current among the Jews to signify a state of bliss at that time,—whether the parable were really original or adapted from one current among the Pharisees,—it would seem that the probability, that no revelation as to the future state is contained in the parable, would be the greater. And if the parable were an adaptation, the argument contained in it would come with much greater force against them at the moment, assailing them in fact with their own weapons on their own ground, although its difference from our Lord's other parables may give occasion for cavils now.

It must be admitted that the parable appears to follow ver. 15 more naturally than ver. 18, which it actually does follow. But I had rather suppose, that we have but a fragmentary summary of the heads of our Lord's discourse to the Pharisees than resort to anything so violent as a transposition. The occurrence of such fragmentary passages is one of our best guarantees for the authenticity of the Gospels, and would in all probability have been carefully avoided in *σεσοφισμένοι μύθοι*. Thus the very

difficulty, which undoubtedly exists here, is to me rather a mark of genuineness than otherwise.

We find that the greatest heathen philosophers wrote entire treatises in order to obtain a negative result, *i. e.*, to shew what was not the case, or what a thing was not; why should not our Lord have composed and uttered a single parable with a negative object instead of, as usual, a positive object? All the ten commandments are negative, although the summaries of their import, given us by our Lord, are positive. If Plato wrote the *Theætetus* simply to disprove various definitions of "knowledge," (*ἐπιστήμη*), why should not our Lord speak a parable simply to disprove the theory of the Pharisees, that riches and prosperity were a mark of God's favour, and poverty and misery of the contrary? No theory of compensation is thus propounded by the parable, but it is simply implied that men's worldly position gives no indication whatever of their future condition, which is determined by their conduct in their several positions, and the use they make of the circumstances in which they are placed. Mr. Flower's remarks upon the manner in which reasons for the misery of Dives and the bliss of Lazarus are forced into the parable, appear to me most just. No doubt such reasons must be supposed to have existed, but they are not stated, or intended to be stated, in the parable, but simply the facts which present a supposed case in direct contravention of the current theory of the Pharisees.

The latter part of the parable appears to have a different and, indeed, a prophetic intention, which was not understood at the moment, but which would come home to every believing heart after the resurrection. Indeed, the former portion of the parable appears to me likely to have been the most forcible and important at the moment, while ever since the resurrection of our Lord its great value has consisted in its latter portion. To my mind, the violence done to the earlier portion of the parable by the majority of commentators, and that done to the whole of it by Mr. Flower under the influence of a not unnatural reaction, are equally uncritical. Several other remarks, which I should otherwise have made, have been anticipated by the very thoughtful reply to Mr. Flower, bearing the signature of Mr. J. L. Blake (pp. 297—304.     A. H. W.

P.S.—I cannot refrain from remarking on page 293, line 18, that *also* is not the usual translation of *δὲ*; and on page 305, line 7 from bottom, that the pluperfect (*ἔβεβλητο*) is not, like the imperfect (*ἠπέλειχον*), generally considered to imply the *frequent* occurrence of an action.



VI. *Rejoinder by the Author.*

THE temperate and most able arguments of Mr. Blake, and of H. P., contained in the July No. of the *J. S. L.*, in answer to my remarks on this parable, would, I think, have been conclusive; at least, they would have removed all doubt and difficulty from my own mind, if, indeed, the parable had been such, and only such, as they have assumed it to be; but this, I think, is not the case. It seems to me that Mr. Blake has hardly adverted at all to what ought to be regarded as the most important feature of the parable; and further, that he, in some slight measure, and my other critics, without any restraint whatever, instead of reasoning upon the parable as we find it, persist in importing into it their own views of what it *ought* to have been, and then found their argument mainly upon this assumption. Although this method is not unusual in the discussion of such topics, it is one in which I cannot acquiesce.

It seems to be admitted on all hands, that the doctrine of compensation—that merely because a man was prosperous or unhappy in this world, his condition in the next would be reversed,—is not one which our Lord elsewhere taught, or was likely to teach; and that, indeed, it would have been at variance with his undoubted teaching on other occasions; that it was not one of those heavenly truths which it was his mission to declare. One of my critics calls it, and I presume rightly, an Ebionite dogma.

It was because I considered that the parable, when read in its plain and obvious sense and meaning, was calculated to teach this doctrine, *and only this*, that I was first led to doubt of its authorship; and those doubts even the admirable argument of Mr. Blake has not removed; for, indeed, he has hardly noticed this, which must, I think, be regarded as the hinge on which the parable rests.

As I read it, and I think I read it aright, the patriarch is represented as attributing the rich man's sufferings *solely* to the circumstance that he had received abundantly—in full—his good things in the course of his earthly life; and in the same way the felicity of Lazarus is attributed to the fact that he had received—received in full—his share of evil things; and the doctrine of compensation, pure and simple, is thus of the very essence and substance of the parable.

This view, I am told, is altogether erroneous; let us, then, reconsider the narrative.

The rich man is described as beseeching the patriarch to allow Lazarus to alleviate his sufferings by bringing him a drop of water to cool his parched tongue, and with this request the

patriarch refuses to comply. But why? He does not reproach the applicant with having despised Lazarus, and neglected to relieve his misery, nor with the vices of luxury and sensuality, nor, indeed, with any other fault or crime.

The answer to the application, which distinctly embodies the reason for the refusal, is this, and only this: Remember—remember what?—that thou hast received thy full share of good things in thy life time; nothing more is left for thee: and *now*,—on that account,—thou art tormented; and (in the same way) Lazarus having received his full share of evil things, now,—on that account,—is comforted.

But the parable does not end here.

The patriarch continues his discourse. Let us carefully mark what follows:—“*And besides all these considerations or reasons,*” καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων τούτοις,—as an additional,—a subsidiary reason—why your prayer cannot be granted; between us and you there is a great gulf fixed. Could any form of words be devised to shew more conclusively that the rich man’s unhappy condition was attributed by the patriarch, only to the circumstance that he had already received his full share of good things?

If, indeed, the parable had not contained this remarkable dialogue,—if the patriarch had been represented as refusing the rich man’s request without assigning any reason whatever for the refusal,—we might well have assumed that the divine justice (for some reason which was not stated) had required and enforced the punishment of the rich man, and the reward of the poor; and in this case, while there would have been no inconsistency between the parable and our Lord’s usual teaching, the lesson which, it is said, it was intended here to teach, would (if it had been intended) have been equally apparent. But as it is, the reason thus assigned in express terms for the infliction of the rich man’s torment, effectually excludes all conjecture and all assumption; and in this point of view, since it is admitted that the doctrine thus taught was “not only utterly unlike our Lord’s teaching, but utterly opposed to it,” we are surely at liberty to doubt of the divine authorship of the parable, assuming (as we may justly do) from the Evangelist’s silence—his unwonted silence—on the subject, that the question of authorship is left an open question.

In my previous remarks upon this subject, I had occasion to notice, that, unlike the undoubted parables of our Lord, this had no relation to those portions of the discourse, which, in the narrative of the Evangelist, precede and follow it. Two of those gentlemen who have criticized my paper have laboured much to shew that this view was erroneous. I confidently leave the point to the judgment of my readers.

Both my opponents observe that I have not adverted to the circumstance, that in the original the connecting particle *δέ* (and, or but) is found prefixed to this parable, which those who translated (may we not say *paraphrased* our version?) have omitted to insert. Perhaps they thought there was good reason for the omission. I think there was; and I observe that it is omitted also in the Vulgate. However, since it is insisted on, let us restore this "missing link," and see in what context the parable is thus placed. The sentence will then read thus: "Whosoever putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery, and whosoever marrieth her that is put away committeth adultery; but (or and) there was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen," etc. Does not this arrangement fully bear out my statement? Can my opponents affirm, or even imagine, that the parable has the least bearing upon, or connection with, the lesson here taught, that a polygamous marriage was neither more nor less than adultery. So far, indeed, from suggesting anything of the kind, they themselves think fit to assume (as will presently be seen without sufficient warrant) that the parable had an entirely different application, and was meant to reprove a sin of an entirely different kind.

But it is said that the parable of the Unjust Steward, which Mr. Prescott considers (I think erroneously) to be intimately connected with this, is introduced by precisely the same expression, "There was a certain rich man." But, surely, it cannot be pretended that by reason of our Lord's allusion to *one* rich man in a parable which *was* connected with his discourse, and which the Evangelist tells us *was* uttered by him, we are bound to accept as *his* the parable of another rich man, which, as we have seen, was *not* connected, or consonant, with his teachings, and was *not* ascribed to him by the Evangelist. Is it not, at least, *possible* that the mention of one rich man in the Gospel may have suggested to some early transcriber, perhaps, even to the Evangelist, to introduce the parable of another rich man with which he was familiar? If, as is well known, the passage in St. John's gospel, as to the angel troubling the waters, and that in the Epistle, as to the three heavenly witnesses, are additions to the Gospel and the Epistle, is it not, at least, possible that this parable, or, at least, the dialogue between Abraham and Dives, may be so likewise? In any event, if we are satisfied that there is good ground to doubt if the parable was spoken by our Lord, it seems reasonable, although not necessary, to conjecture that it may have been added by some later writer, rather than that it formed part of the original Gospel.

One of my critics has suggested that the difficulty caused

by the want of connection between the parable and its context (a difficulty of which he evidently feels the force), may have been caused by *transposition*, and that the parable would follow most naturally as a practical illustration of the conclusion of the thirteenth verse. To this I answer, that the doubt as to the divine authorship of the parable is chiefly due, not to its place, but to its character; the want of connection with the context is only an ancillary ground for doubt; by itself it would be of little importance, but most important in combination with the other reasons assigned. The most ancient *codices* all agree in placing the parable where we now find it, and that ancient Christian testimony, under whose flag it seems we ought to range ourselves, has never, that I am aware, sanctioned or even suggested such a transposition. If transposed at all, the transposition was made before Augustine's time, since he received it in the order in which we now have it. Besides, if we are at liberty to *transpose* when it suits our views, may we not also be at liberty to *reject*, since in either case we do but mould the canon in order to suit our own notion of what the writer intended? Nor even if we should adopt the method thus suggested, would the difficulty be removed or even alleviated. We cannot reject the intervening verses (15—18); and if not, where can we place them better than they are now placed, or as well? Mr. Prescott indeed proposes to place them in a kind of parenthesis, forgetting, as it would seem, that he has also insisted that we could not require a stronger link than the particle *δέ*, which, he says, connects the parable with the lesson contained in the verse *immediately* preceding.

Further, the parable clearly cannot be attributed to the lesson taught in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses. Our Lord is there reproving the sin of covetousness and avarice, whereas this parable, if directed against any sin or vice at all, could only apply to the very opposite vice of luxury or prodigality; it is not a miser or covetous man that is spoken of, but one who was clothed in expensive raiment and fared splendidly. It may be true, as Archbishop Trench has observed, that both vices spring from unbelief, but it is not true that our Lord was accustomed to reprove one vice by an example or parable shewing the ill effects of the very opposite.

It remains now to consider what my opponents propose to *substitute* for that which they propose to omit. It will be seen, that following in the steps of Archbishop Trench and many other commentators, they persist in reading the parable as if it attributed to the rich man an inhuman disregard of the poor man's necessities. This was the view taken by St. Augustine;

the Church of Rome adopted his version, and the writers of the Reformed Churches in this, as in many other more important particulars, have implicitly followed the Church of Rome; and this, I presume, is that ancient Christian testimony which ought, in Mr. Prescott's view, to supersede the necessity for the investigation of difficult passages of Scripture. We are told, "that a poor man diseased, starving, imploring to be fed with the scraps from the rich man's table, one for whom the very dogs cared, lay at his gate; but love is quenched by sensual indulgence, he passed him by, despised and neglected him. The beggar evidently never received any of his good things." And again, "it was not because the rich man had received good things that he was in the place of torment, but because he had misused them, made them his alone." And H. P. also says, that the parable teaches righteous retribution for the sin of Dives, in his hard-hearted contempt of the poor, and luxurious squandering on self.

Notwithstanding, however, the authority arrayed against me, I am compelled to affirm, or reaffirm, that this view of the case is utterly unwarranted and erroneous, and that even that ancient Christian testimony under whose flag one of my critics professes to shield himself, cannot avail to save it from condemnation. That, in fact, Mr. Prescott has here composed a romance or Scripture mystery, which he takes, and would have his readers accept, for the Scripture.

Not one word occurs in the Gospel from which it can be inferred that the rich man even knew of the existence of Lazarus, much less that he treated him with inhumanity and contempt; the only relation that is stated to have existed between them is, that Lazarus was placed at the gate, or rather in the porch, of the rich man's house, in order that he might receive his share of the broken fragments which then, as now, were frequently distributed to the necessitous at the gates or porches of the rich. If in our own time, it were found that some poor beggar went daily to the gate of Lambeth Palace, or St. James's, to receive broken bread and meat, surely no one would venture, on that account, to impute inhumanity and hard-heartedness to the Primate or the Queen; and yet such a transaction would be the exact parallel of the narrative.

But not only is it thus evident that the narrative contains no imputation or suggestion of a want of charity on the part of Dives; but we may very well conclude from what is said, that such an intention was not in the mind of the author.

The beggar was laid at the rich man's gate or porch not because he was *not* relieved there, but because he *was*—ἐβέβλητο

—he was *accustomed* to be laid there—USUALLY laid there—because he desired and looked for—*ἐπιθυμῶν*—the relief, which could hardly have been the case had he not been in the habit of receiving it. Moreover as Dean Alford has well observed, the words which immediately follow with reference to the dogs (*ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες*) imply that he *got* the fragments which he both needed and desired. And further, as has already been noticed, the patriarch is represented as assigning as a reason for the torment suffered by the rich man, not that he had neglected or despised his poor fellow creature, but that he had had his full share of good things in this life,—that he had exhausted his portion, and just in the same way (and this has an important bearing on this part of the argument) Lazarus is represented as enjoying felicity, *not* for his charity or good works, but because he had had his full share of affliction. Can we suppose that the patriarch was represented as suppressing the true ground for his refusal to relieve the rich man, and substituting for it a mere pretext?

Having dealt with the parable in the manner above described, my opponents may well take credit, that by their mode of interpretation it forms an harmonious picture, consonant with itself in every part. It may be fully admitted that they *have made* an harmonious picture, but is it not their work rather than that of the author? Nothing indeed is easier, if we are at liberty to obliterate that which seems to us not to harmonize, and supply its place by something which does; and this can readily be done by the ingenious device so often practised of suggesting an "*undercurrent of thought*." But is this a method sanctioned by ancient Christian testimony? I think not, although I confess that it is not seldom practised in our own time. The dignity and importance of the subject seem often to be used as pretexts for treating it with indignity. Modes of reasoning are adopted in theology which, in any other science, would neither be allowed nor attempted, and it is to this, amongst other causes, that we may attribute the low ebb to which this, the most important and interesting of all sciences, has fallen.

It is especially to be borne in mind, when considering the subject under this aspect, that we are dealing not with a narrative, but with a *parable*—an *illustration* of a lesson or argument. In a narrative, the author may well omit many circumstances; some he may deem immaterial, while others may not have come within his knowledge; but with a parable it is quite otherwise. The author must be considered to have said all that he means, and no more; the argument is his, and his only; he is "*dominus litis*;" and the illustrations by means of which he enforces or ex-

plains his argument are also his, and his alone. To affirm that he did not mean what he has said, or that he has said what he did not mean,—to suggest undercurrents of thought, of which no trace is to be found, is neither more nor less than to suggest that the author was incompetent to the work he had undertaken—that he did not know how to conduct his argument—that in this case the parable was deficient, and that we are at liberty to supply its defects. The mere possession of riches here is not a good ground for torments hereafter; it must therefore be left out of consideration,—a new one must be found; sacrilege or murder might have done, but under the circumstances, inhumanity to the other personage spoken of seems most appropriate. What should we think of any one who would venture thus to deal with the Sermon on the Mount, or with any of our Lord's parables? And is not this very attempt of my opponents to amend and supplement the parable by their own suggestions, equivalent to a statement by them, not by me, that it was an imperfect work?

And here I shall cite a passage from a work of a popular commentator of our own time, which was designed to strengthen the faith of the wavering and feeble-minded. What is thus quoted is indeed altogether in discord with previous portions of the same essay, in which we are told that it would not be difficult to shew, "that in very many passages (of Scripture) meanings must certainly be admitted which it may be probable were not intended by the author;" and that the "instances in which words have been found to involve meanings not recognized at the time by the reader or writer," "are by no means few or exceptional." I confess my inability to understand how a writer's words are to be taken to mean that which he did not intend, and of which he was unconscious. That, however, is the author's affair, not mine; I quote him here both as against himself and my opponents, because what is said, although not particularly new, is so appropriate that it might almost have been intended for their reproof.

• "The first rule," (for the interpretation of Scripture) "is an extremely obvious one, yet a rule which, if it had been always followed, would have spared the Church a large amount of bitterness and controversy. It is simply this,—ascertain, as clearly as it may be possible, the literal and grammatical meaning of the words. In other words, ascertain first what is the ordinary lexical meaning of the individual words, and next, what, according to the ordinary rules of syntax, is the first and simplest meaning of the sentence which they make up. Still it must be clear to every quiet observer, that there is a strong desire evinced in many quarters to evade the rule, and, under cover of escape from pedantry, to endeavour to

make Scripture mean what we think, or what we wish, not what it really says to us. The mode of procedure is simple, but effective. We are first told, as Chrysostom told us long ago, that we are to catch the spirit of the author, and next invited to take a step onward, and do what that great interpreter neither did nor sanctioned,—rectify by the aid of our own ‘verifying faculty’ the imperfect utterance of words of which it is assumed we have caught the real and intended meaning. No mode of interpretation is more completely fascinating than this intuitional method, none that is more thoroughly welcome to the excessive self-sufficiency in regard to Scriptural interpretation, of which we are now having so much clear and so much melancholy evidence. To sit calmly in our studies, to give force and meaning to the faltering utterances of inspired men, to correct the tottering logic of an Apostle, to clear up misconceptions of an Evangelist, and to do this without dust and toil, without expositors and without versions, without anxieties about the meanings of particles, or humiliations at discoveries of lacking scholarship,—to do all this, thus easily and serenely, is the temptation held out; and the weak, the vain, the ignorant, and the prejudiced, are clearly proving unable to resist it. Hence the necessity of a return to first principles, however homely they may appear.”—Ellicott, “On Scripture and its Interpretation,” in *Aids to Faith*, pp. 399, 427.

Exception has been taken to my observation, that this parable in its composition—in what I have ventured to term its *apparatus*—widely differed from those which were beyond all question spoken by Christ. But on a careful reconsideration I find no reason to modify or retract that opinion. Here we find the future conditions of reward and punishment anticipated or antedated. The saved and condemned are represented as conversing and reasoning together across a vast gulf or chasm. Human affections and passions surviving human life. It is *Abraham*, and not God or Christ, who is represented as the sovereign ruler of the future state, for it is to Abraham alone that Dives addresses his prayer, and it is Abraham who refuses it. As I contend (and I think with success) he is represented as assigning a reason, which it is agreed is incompatible with Christian doctrine, and he omits to notice that which we are told was the real reason, and thus (if we adopt my opponents’ view) he is to be considered as saying that which he did not mean, and meaning what he did not say; and then, having given a reason why the prayer *ought not* to be refused, he is represented as adding that it was *impossible* to comply with it, as if the power which placed these men where they were, could not also remove them. I do not venture, nor have I ventured, to suggest, that such a parable could not have been spoken by Christ; but notwithstanding the arguments on the other side, I affirm, with confidence, that in these respects it widely differs from every



one of his undoubted parables. We cannot recognize here the perfect simplicity and artlessness, may we not say homeliness, which characterize the Lost Silver, and the Prodigal Son, and indeed every one of those beautiful apologues, by means of which the Great Teacher was accustomed to deliver those divine truths which he condescended to announce.

If, indeed, anything were wanting to shew the great dissimilarity between this and our Lord's parables, it might be found in this,—that whereas His parables are so simple and so practical that the peasant and the child alike can, and do, read them with pleasure and profit, understanding them in one and the same sense, we can hardly find two critics or commentators who are agreed as to the lesson to be gathered from this.

St. Augustine says that it may be understood as typifying, or representing, Christ in the person of Lazarus; the Pharisees are the rich man; the crumbs are works of mercy and justice; the wounds are the incarnation; and the dogs are the Gentiles, etc.<sup>b</sup> Archbishop Trench seems to think that it was intended to rebuke profuseness or prodigal excess in living, springing from unbelief. Another no less able critic has suggested that the parable was intended to enjoin love to God, and a desire for an inheritance in heaven.

Nor are the views of my five critics less varied; each interprets the parable differently from the rest, and we are thus engaged in a sort of hexagonal contest. Mr. Prescott says that the parable was intended to inculcate that love from man to man, of which the Pharisees had so strongly shewn their want; but he also says, that by means of the connecting particle (*δέ*) it is intimately linked to the preceding passage, which relates solely to adultery, and if so, it must be taken to be in reproof of that sin. Mr. Blake, on the other hand, regards this as the supplement or continuation of the parable of the Unjust Steward, and he says that the appropriate lesson for the Pharisees to learn would have been a resolution to be henceforth less Pharisaically exacting, and to use the remaining period of *their* stewardship, if still unjustly, at least *more mercifully*. Again, H. P. considers that the parable teaches righteous retribution for hard-hearted contempt of the poor, and luxurious squandering on self, and that it was thus addressed to the *Pharisees*. Mr. Row, on the other hand, considers that it was addressed to the *disciples*, and was connected with John xvii.; and was thus intended to enforce our Lord's warning against the sin of placing stumbling-blocks in the way

---

<sup>b</sup> *Questionum Evangelicarum*, lib. 2, cap. 38.

of others. A. H. W. suggests that our Lord might have spoken this parable simply to disprove the theory of the Pharisees, that riches and prosperity were a mark of God's favour, and poverty and misery of the contrary.

"*In universalibus latet error.*" If a parable may thus be construed to mean anything and everything in general, according to the varying fancies of its expositors, it must cease to mean anything in particular. If it is thus alike uncertain, (even to learned and able men,) to whom it was addressed, and what it was designed to teach, does it not so far fail to answer the end or function of a parable, that we may, without rashness or presumption, entertain doubts of the authorship?

It will not fail to be observed that my opponents have omitted to notice an important portion of this argument. It is evident that the parable is designed to represent the personages spoken of, as exactly the foils or contrasts of each other. But the happiness of Lazarus is in no sense attributed to his virtues or moral excellencies of any kind, and no one, until now, ever thought of attributing any to him. It is because he had had his full share of evil things in this life, and only on that account that he is represented as reposing on Abraham's bosom. And the exact contrast which it seems obviously intended to draw, could only be rendered perfect by representing Dives as tormented, not on account of his vices or delinquencies, but because he had had his full share of the good things of this life. In any other view the symmetry of the parable would be lost. H. P. indeed argues, and Mr. Blake seems to do so too, that because Lazarus is represented as saved, we must take him to have been a man of blameless life. But this is to beg the whole question. Until it is clearly shewn who was the author of the parable, the statements which it may contain do not come within the category of divine truths, and no argument can be founded upon the assumption that they are such.

Exception is taken by Mr. Prescott and Mr. Blake, to an observation contained in my former paper, that the representation in the parable that the righteous *had already passed* to their state of bliss, and the unrighteous to their punishment, was inconsistent with our Lord's teaching in the Gospel of St. Matthew, as to the events of the great day of judgment when the Son of God should come in his glory; and on this head I am reminded of our Lord's address to the thief on the cross, which, however, appears to have no bearing on the question. We are not to understand by this expression *paradise* generally, but simply "*the paradise*," "*the garden*;" our translators having in this and in 2 Col. xii. 4, and in very many other important instances, either

through ignorance or carelessness, omitted to notice the definite article which occurs in the original. But whatever else we may gather from this mysterious expression, we are not at liberty to infer from it that the poor thief was at once transported from the cross, to the regions of heavenly and perpetual felicity reserved for the saints of God. The garden was not heaven. He was to be with Christ, and Christ himself did not rise from Hades until the third day from the crucifixion; nor did he ascend into heaven until many days after his resurrection.

Further than this, it cannot be argued that because the thief was to be in the garden, or the paradise, on the day of his death, that, therefore, we must understand that the wicked pass at once from this world to their state of punishment. Our Saviour never so taught; all his teachings have a contrary bearing, nor is there any passage in Scripture which favours such a belief. What I have advanced, therefore, as shewing the discrepancy between this parable and Christ's teaching, in this particular, is in no way displaced. Mr. Prescott, indeed, observes that the separation immediately following death is described in the parable as *irrevocable* but not *final*. I cannot understand this distinction, which savours of a confused notion of purgatory.

Surely it cannot be intended to assert, as Scripture doctrine, that the wicked are to be punished with grievous torments until the day of judgment, then to be judged according to their works, and then to be remitted afresh to their places of punishment. Yet from the tenor of Mr. Blake's and Mr. Prescott's observations it would seem that this is their opinion. Whence derived I know not, but I think not from Scripture.

In conclusion, I must ask leave to add a few words in my own vindication; not for my own sake, but in the interest of free discussion,—in the interest of those who may write for, or read this Journal,—the only one, I believe, in which it is possible to consider questions of this kind fairly and reasonably, and at the same time with a due regard and respect to the inspired Word. I know, by experience, how little either of favour or justice is usually dealt out to those who impugn either traditional interpretation, or traditional methods of interpretation, but I did not expect that an argument on so important and interesting a subject would have been treated so unfairly as it has been treated by one of my three critics.

I can only say, with reference to the passages of which I complain, that I have neither impugned, nor am I capable of impugning, the Scripture canon, or impairing or attempting to impair its efficacy. That as regards the works of Strauss,

De Wette, Seppe, Renan, and the Tübingen school, and the worst school of German writers (whoever they may be), I have neither praised them, nor quoted them, nor alluded to them, and for this sufficient reason, that I have never read one word of them, except casually in reviews and quotations; and my only rationalism consists, in endeavouring, by the aid of those faculties which my Maker has given me, to apprehend, as best I may, the meaning of those Scriptures which are also his gift, and that, without the slightest regard, on the one hand, to French scoffing and German rationalism, and on the other, with very little regard to that teaching of ancient Christianity which I am accused of disparaging, knowing, as I do, how often that testimony has been appealed to, to extenuate or sanction crimes and cruelties, how many faults and follies, how many misinterpretations and misrepresentations of Scripture, that phrase has been, and still is, used to cover. If my critic's rationalism had been of the same quality, he would have been more sparing of the censures to which I allude.

Lastly, I must deprecate the usage of my critics in assuming that *they* are defending, and that *I* am in any way impeaching the decrees of divine justice. When such unfair assumptions are thus introduced into a discussion on either side, they seldom fail to beget counter assertions and assumptions, and so the argument degenerates into a dispute. But this is not the way in which an argument should be conducted; at least not in the pages of this Journal.

Neither justice, nor any other of the divine attributes, is here at all in question. The contention is one of fact:—was, or was not, this parable spoken by our blessed Lord? In the entire absence of any statement by the evangelists (whose testimony would have set the question at rest), I should be glad to learn what testimony is proposed to be substituted for theirs, so as to preclude our recourse to the only other means of ascertaining the truth,—a discussion, in a spirit becoming the importance of the subject, of the internal evidences afforded by the parable itself.

Viewing the subject under this aspect, it appears to me that, inasmuch as the parable is unconnected with the context; is inconsistent with our Lord's teaching on other occasions; and, unlike every one of His undoubted parables in its composition and structure, we may reasonably doubt if it be His. My opponents do not agree in these views, but on that account they are not justified in affirming that what is represented to have taken place was by the divine decree, and thus imputing to me a design to disparage the divine justice. In so doing, they

assume, in their own favour, the whole subject of the controversy, and unfairly distort the tenor of my argument. If I were disposed, as I am not, to follow their example, I might impute it to them, that *they* were disparaging the divine excellence and attributes by ascribing to our Lord sentiments unworthy of him; they would repel the imputation with just indignation, yet such a proceeding would not be more unreasonable than Mr. Prescott's imputing to me a design to steal away some portion of the Christian canon; than Mr. Blake's suggestion, that my remarks were calculated to confer human imperfection of thought, heart, or purpose, upon the ways and works of divine wisdom, power and love; or his statement that the difference in moral character and spiritual aspirations between the two men is sufficiently evident, if we believe that God is just in deciding their fate after death. Surely a belief in the supreme justice of God may be quite consistent with a conviction that, since nothing is said or implied as to the moral character of the personages spoken of, it is not competent to us to imagine or assert it; and that thus we may be permitted to doubt if the parable really proceeded from Him who spake as never man spake.

After most of the preceding remarks were in type, the Editor permitted me to peruse the letters of Mr. C. A. Row and A. H. W. (IV. and V.), but as neither time nor space are now available to consider them as fully and carefully as they deserve, I shall content myself with indicating shortly those points upon which I differ from the former of those gentlemen; much that he has advanced having been, indeed, answered in the foregoing observations. With reference to his argument, founded upon the name given to Lazarus, it seems to me unreasonable to deduce any inference whatever as to the moral character of the personage spoken of from the name given to him, especially when, as in this case, it was a common name with the people to whom the parable was spoken. Nor, if any inference be allowable from the mere use of a name, would it follow that we must draw that which Mr. Row proposes. *God a help*, may, perhaps, well be construed to imply that the person so named was poor and helpless as regarded man,—a despised and miserable creature, who had no helper but that merciful Being who is the helper of all his creatures alike; but it by no means follows that this name should afford any indication of the man's moral character. Nor, if such an inference could be drawn, would it materially affect the question. The difficulties which attend it (and which relate to the condition of *Dives*, and the causes of it)

might be alleviated, but would not be removed, even if we were to hold that *Lazarus* was an exemplary and blameless person. In that case, we should still be left to wonder and conjecture how it happened that the author of the parable had omitted to notice a circumstance so important, or, indeed, essential.

There is much more force in the arguments which Mr. Row has so ably and lucidly stated, founded upon the second portion of this remarkable dialogue, and, but for the former portion, might have been conclusive. But if (as, I think, I have succeeded in shewing) the rich man's misery is attributed by the patriarch solely to his possession of earthly prosperity, what follows as to the danger and repentance of his five brethren can in no way alter or impair the effect of the previous teaching, although it certainly does render the parable more difficult and obscure. It is of *Dives* only, and *his* fate, that we have to consider; and, as regards *him*, the lesson was closed when the first request which he made was refused. The danger in which others were placed, and the remedy proposed, are immaterial topics as regards the main question. We are not at liberty to supersede the express declaration of the patriarch by any suggestions of our own. We have no right, as Dean Ellicott has observed, to clear up what we may consider "the misconceptions of an Evangelist," and if so, and if in this way nothing more is to be imputed to the rich man's five brethren than the enjoyment of wealth and prosperity, we are still left at a loss to conceive in what their peril consisted; while, on the other hand, if we are at liberty to conclude, from what is said, that *their* character and conduct were indeed such as needed repentance, and that thus they differed from their brother, we cannot draw from their peril and their need of repentance any inference as to his moral character while on earth, or the justice of his final doom.

August 20, 1864.<sup>c</sup>

J. W. FLOWER.

---

<sup>c</sup> As we do not think much more can well be said on either side, we must here close the interesting discussion respecting the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.—ED. J. S. L.

---

### ANALOGY BETWEEN THE APOCALYPSE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT AND THAT OF THE NEW.

THE writer of an able article on the Apocalypse in the *Westminster Review*, October 1861, observes that,—

“Borrowing freely from the elder prophets their imagery, their supernatural machinery, and their historical conceptions, the seer of the Revelation converts them with the privilege allowed to great creative genius to his own special purposes. . . . From Daniel he takes his historical conception of Pagan empire, arising brute-like out of the sea; his vision of the Son of Man now seen in the clouds, now seen in priestly and princelike attire by the side of the great river Hiddekel; his king of the fierce countenance; his Michael the great prince, the guardian angel of the sacred Hebrew nation; his resurrection, judgment, and kingdom of God.”

It will be the endeavour of this paper to shew, that with regard to the above-mentioned prophet, the obligations of the seer of Patmos are most certain, and his “borrowings most systematic;” and that whilst images are occasionally taken from other prophets, he almost acquires the character of a plagiarist in his servile imitation of Daniel.

1. In tracing out this analogy we may notice first the doubtful position occupied by both writings in the canon: the former being reduced by the Jews to the rank of Hagiographa, and the latter classed by some critics among the Deutero-canonical, or books of the second order. The genuineness of the latter we know to have been questioned by the early Church. Speaking of canonical books, Eusebius says, “To these may be added, *if it seem good*, the Apocalypse of John. . . . which some reject, but others reckon among the acknowledged books.”<sup>a</sup> The analogy between the two starts from the question of authorship: a doubt is thrown over the authenticity of both writings; this hesitation, more than anything else, allowing a “liberty of prophesying” in their respective interpretation, which could not have been exercised in the case of books, whose authority had never been questioned.

2. A second feature of resemblance is traceable in what may be called, for want of a better name, the apocalyptic character of both writings. After the period of the exile a new style of teaching took the place of legitimate prophecy. An angelic machinery was introduced to supply the lost “Word of the Lord” which came to the ancient prophet, and vision and symbol superseded the sublime sayings which fell from the lips of the seers of old. A supernatural element (possibly the result

---

<sup>a</sup> *Eccles. Hist.*, iii., 25.

of contact with their eastern conquerors) became necessary in order to command respect, and a continuous angelology was exerted for the purpose of unfolding the divine decrees to men. These apocalyptic features distinguish the writings of Daniel and John from the other Scriptures: the Book of Daniel, with its abundant angelology, differing as completely from the writings of the captivity, as the Apocalypse from the gospels and epistles of the New Testament.

3. The circumstances of persecution for conscience sake under which both appear to have been written, present also a remarkable conformity. The period with which the former is concerned is designated a "time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time:" that of the latter as "the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world to try them that dwell upon the earth." During the earlier season of trial "many are purified and made white and tried;" under the latter the souls of white-robed martyrs are heard crying under the altar, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." The duration over which these persecutions extend seems also to include an equal period. According to Daniel, the period is "a time, times, and an half;" or, "a thousand two hundred and ninety days." According to the seer of the Revelation, it is also "a time, times, and an half;" or "a thousand two hundred and threescore days."

4. A further agreement may be traced in the scope and design of the respective prophecies: the object of the earlier Apocalypse being to sustain the martyrs of the Maccabæan period under a season of religious persecution arising from the blasphemous attempt of a heathen tyrant to subvert the religion of Jehovah: that of the latter to support the martyrs of the first century under the pressure of analogous calamities arising from the attempt of Nero to abolish the Christian faith. In either case the heathen appear to have concentrated their efforts against the faithful; and the question at issue was the supremacy of idolatry or the worship of the one Supreme God.

5. A like analogy is to be noticed in the fate which overtakes equally the Syrian and Roman tyrant: that of the former being symbolized by "the beast slain and his body given to the burning flame;" that of the latter by the evident parallelism of "the beast . . . taken, and cast alive into a lake of fire and brimstone."

6. Other minor points of resemblance might be adduced, such as the compulsory worship of the golden image set up on the plain of Dura, contrasted with the compulsory worship of the image of the beast; the resurrection of the faithful martyrs



when "many that slept in the dust of the earth should awake," corresponding with the first resurrection of those who had not worshipped the beast nor his image; the book containing the names of those who should be delivered, agreeing with the "Lamb's book of life;" the consummation of the Syrian tyranny when "all these things should be finished," reproduced in the consummation announced by the seventh angel, when "the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." But perhaps enough has now been said to shew that a marked analogy exists between the first and the second Apocalypse, extending not only to the form and structure, but to the ideas and language employed by the respective writers. A sufficient reason for this may be found in the corresponding circumstances of the respective periods: similar seasons of persecution and suffering for conscience sake naturally evoking similarity of prophetic treatment. The author of the Apocalypse, as is not unusual with prophetic writers, regarding his predecessors' teaching as common property, and adapting it to the events of his own times.

I. A principal feature adopted by both writers, and especially by the latter, is the frequent employment of angelic machinery. The analogy between them in this particular is of the most striking kind. By way of illustrating our principle, we shall subjoin in parallel columns the passages which describe the superhuman revealer of Daniel's visions, and those which delineate the appearance of the Son of Man.

#### ANGELIC MESSENGER OF DANIEL.

"Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz: his body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude. . . . And when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground" (Dan. x. 5, 6, 9).

"I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished" (Dan. xii. 7).

#### APPEARANCE OF THE SON OF MAN.

"One like unto the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters . . . and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength; and when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead" (Rev. i. 13—17).

"And the angel which I saw stand upon the sea and upon the earth lifted up his hand to heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever and ever . . . that there should be time no longer: but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished" (Rev. x. 5—7).

These passages, mutually compared, exhibit not merely general resemblance, but identity of thought and language. The man clothed in the priestly linen garment, "whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz," corresponds with "the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle." His "body like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning," agrees with "his countenance as the sun shining in his strength." His "eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass," are expressions analogous to "his eyes as a flame of fire, and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace." "The voice of his words like the voice of a multitude," is reproduced in the "voice as the sound of many waters" or, "of a great multitude" (Rev. xix. 6); whilst the terror of the prophet at the greatness of the vision depicted in the words "there remained no strength in me. . . . I was in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground," is repeated in the parallelism, "and when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead." Similarly in the analogous visions of Dan. xii. and Rev. x., the man standing upon the waters of the river corresponds with the angel standing upon the sea and upon the earth; his invocation, when he "held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven," is repeated in his "lifting up his hand to heaven;" his oath, when he "swore by him that liveth for ever," is reproduced in the similar oath of the Apocalyptic angel. The purport of the oath, that when the power of the holy people had been scattered for three and an half years the indignation should be accomplished, finds a parallel in the declaration that "there should be time no longer" [no more delay]; but in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.

II. Having secured attention to the communication they are about to make by the introduction of the superhuman element into their respective prophecies, the Maccabæan writer and his ingenious imitator bring upon the scene of their historical dramas the great persecutors of the Jewish and Christian Churches, whose deeds of atrocity bear so close a resemblance that the description of the one serves as a pattern for that of the other. A comparison of the passages in which these are respectively described will shew the judgment of the seer in selecting for his model a character which answered so completely to that which he desired to delineate.

## ANTIOCHUS.

"I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast (came up from the sea, vii. 3) . . . and it had ten horns" (Dan. vii. 7).

"I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn . . . and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things" (Dan. vii. 8).

## BLASPHEMIES OF ANTIOCHUS.

"He shall speak great words against the most High" (Dan. vii. 25).

"He shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished" (Dan. xi. 36).

## PERSECUTIONS OF ANTIOCHUS.

"The same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them" (Dan. vii. 21).

"He shall wear out the saints of the most High, and think to change times and laws" (Dan. vii. 25).

## COMPULSORY WORSHIP OF ANTIOCHUS.

"Do ye not serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up . . . If ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace, and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands" (Dan. iv. 14, 15).

"Whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions" (Dan. vi. 7).

## DURATION OF THE PERSECUTION OF ANTIOCHUS.

"They shall be given into his hand until a time, times, and the dividing of time" (Dan. vii. 25).

"It shall be for a time, times, and an half" (Dan. xii. 7).

"From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days" (Dan. xii. 11).

## NERO.

"I stood upon the sand of the sea, and saw a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns" (Rev. xiii. 1).

"And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon" (Rev. xiii. 11).

## BLASPHEMIES OF NERO.

"And there was given unto him a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies . . . and he opened his mouth in blasphemy against God to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven" (Rev. xiii. 5, 6).

## PERSECUTIONS OF NERO.

"And it was given to him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them" (Rev. xiii. 7).

"The beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them and kill them" (Rev. xi. 7).

## COMPULSORY WORSHIP OF NERO.

"He had power to give life unto the image of the beast . . . and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed" (Rev. xiii. 15).

"He causeth the earth and them which dwell therein to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed" (Rev. xiii. 12).

## DURATION OF THE PERSECUTION OF NERO.

"Power was given unto him to continue forty and two months" (Rev. xiii. 5).

"My two witnesses . . . shall prophesy a thousand two hundred and threescore days, clothed in sackcloth. . . . And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them and kill them" (Rev. xi. 3, 7).

## DESTRUCTION OF ANTIOCHUS.

"I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body given to the burning flame" (Dan. vii. 11).

"He shall be broken without hand" (Dan. viii. 25).

"He shall come to his end, and none shall help him" (Dan. xi. 45).

## DESTRUCTION OF NERO.

"These both (the beast and the false prophet) were cast alive into a lake of fire, burning with brimstone" (Rev. xix. 20; xx. 10).

"The beast . . . shall go into perdition" (Rev. xvii. 8, 11).

It would seem from an attentive consideration of the preceding parallelisms, that the writer of the Apocalypse, availing himself of that facility of adaptation for which he is remarkable, was led to consider the sacrilegious Syrian the prototype of the impious Roman, and to recognize in the madman Antiochus the precursor of the monster Nero. Perhaps it is not too much to say, that the identity between the persecutors could not have been introduced accidentally into their respective themes by the writers of Daniel and the Apocalypse. It appears to us indisputable that the former must have been the prototype of which the latter was the voice and echo. The area of the former book is occupied with the description of a heathen king, who rises out of the ten horns of the fourth Grecian empire; is guilty of wanton blasphemy against the God of heaven; wears out the saints of the Most High by abominable tortures; compels the Jewish people to forsake their own religion, and to worship the gods of his adoration; whose persecutions continue for the space of three and a half years, but who is finally broken without (human) hand, and overthrown. The area of the latter is taken up with the description of his counterpart and antitype. As Antiochus rises from the fourth Grecian ten-horned beast of Daniel, so does Nero rise from the corresponding ten-horned Roman beast of John. He too is guilty of wanton blasphemy<sup>b</sup> against the God of heaven;<sup>c</sup> wears out the Christian saints; compels them to worship his image (the usual test to which the Christians were submitted);<sup>d</sup> continues his persecutions for three

<sup>b</sup> "Nero took up arms against that very religion which acknowledges the one true God. He was the first of the emperors which displayed himself an enemy of piety towards the Deity. He publicly announced himself as the chief enemy of God" (Eus., *His.*, ii., 25). The following is a specimen of the religious adoration paid to him: returning to Rome after having been a conqueror in the Grecian games, he is received with these words,—"Victories Olympic! Victories Pythian! Thou august august—to Nero the Hercules—to Nero the Apollo. The only conqueror in the games of the circus—the eternal one—sacred voice. Happy those who hear thee" (Dio., *Cass.*)

<sup>c</sup> "Consult your edicts; there you will find that Nero was the first who savagely persecuted this sect, springing up chiefly at Rome, with the imperial sword. But we even glory in such a leader of our punishment; for whoever knows what he was, is able to understand that only some great and good thing could be condemned by Nero" (Tertullian, *Apolog.*, v.)

<sup>d</sup> "I have taken this course about those who have been brought before me as

and a half years; and at last perishes miserably, or in Apocalyptic terms, "goeth into perdition." Surely this parallelism is not the result of chance. Letters thrown heedlessly upon the floor do not form themselves by accident into a beautiful poem, neither do emblems drawn at random from the mystical books of the Old and New Testaments, present analogies without design and purpose. The historical points of agreement already adduced seem to shew one of two things: either the latter writer must have imitated the former, or, as is not uncommonly held, the respective prophets must have treated of the same events. Mature consideration assures us of the fallacy of this last theory. It now appears to us that no satisfactory interpretation can be given, which does not recognize the fact that these prophecies are double one of another. But as we compare the identity of symbol and vision, thought and language, structure and style, we cease to wonder that interpreters should have fallen into the pardonable mistake of applying the characteristics by which Antiochus is distinguished to the circumstances of Nero.

III. In addition to the above-mentioned points of personal resemblance between the Syrian and Roman persecutors, other features of resemblance present themselves arising from the peculiar circumstances of the respective times. The period with which the narratives are concerned is one of suffering for conscience sake, when the blood of the saints was shed like water round about Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them. This time of trouble is described by both writers in somewhat similar terms; the endurance of the martyrs, under the Syrian tyranny, being reflected in that of those who suffered under the Neronian persecution. We subjoin a few of the most striking parallelisms.

#### THE TIME OF TROUBLE.

"There shall be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time" (Dan. xii. 1).

#### THE MARTYRS.

"They shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil many days . . . and some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them,

#### THE TIME OF TROUBLE.

"The hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world to try them that dwell upon the earth" (Rev. iii. 10).

#### THE MARTYRS.

"I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the Word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice,

Christians; if they persevered in their confessions, I ordered them to be executed." Of others who recanted the writer says,—*"These denied that they were Christians now or ever had been; they called upon the gods and supplicated your image, which I caused to be brought to me for that purpose with frankincense and wine; they also cursed Christ, none of which things it is said can any of those that are really Christians be compelled to do"* (Plin., *ad Traj.*, epist.

and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end" (Dan. xi. 33—35).

"Many shall be purified and made white and tried" (Dan. xii. 10).

#### THE BOOK OF DELIVERANCE.

"The judgment was set, and the books were opened . . . at that time thy people shall be delivered every one that shall be found written in the Book" (Dan. vii. 10; xii. 1).

#### THE RESURRECTION.

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt" (Dan. xii. 2).

#### THE BLESSING.

"Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days: but go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days" (Dan. xii. 12, 13).

"They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever" (Dan. xii. 3).

The reader will not fail to have noticed in these parallel texts a marked correspondence of emblematical figure and verbal agreement. Strange and unusual ideas such as those of the "book" and the "resurrection," are employed by either prophet. The "time of trouble" of the former, re-appears in the "great tribulation" of the latter; and the "purified (ones) made white, and tried" of Daniel, in the "palms" and "white robes" of John. The distinct idea of a resurrection, when "many that slept in the dust of the earth should awake" (explained by some of the political restoration of the holy people) is peculiar to Daniel, and seems to have been elicited by the extraordinary sufferings of those days. Like the first resurrec-

saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" (Rev. vi. 9, 10).

"These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb" (Rev. vii. 14).

#### THE BOOK OF DELIVERANCE.

"I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened, and another book was opened which is the Book of life . . . and whosoever was not found written in the Book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. xx. 12, 15).

#### THE RESURRECTION.

"I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God . . . and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. . . . This is the first resurrection" (Rev. xx. 4, 5).

#### THE BLESSING.

"Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection; on such the second death hath no power; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years" (Rev. xx. 6).

"And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. xxii. 5).

\* "Redditâ autem victoriâ, et cæsis Antiochi ducibus, ipsoque Antiocho in Perside mortuo, salvatus est populus Israel, omnes qui scripti erant in libro Dei, hoc est, qui Legem fortissime defenderunt; et contrarie qui deleti sunt de libro, hoc est, qui prævaricatores exstiterunt Legis, et Antiochi fuerunt partium. Tunc, ait (Porphyrius) hi qui quasi in terræ pulvere, dormiebant, et operti

tion of the Apocalypse, it is partial, and reserved only for the faithful. This idea, of later growth than the period of the captivity, was familiar to the Maccabæan age. "The king of the world (says the second of the seven brethren martyred by Antiochus), shall raise us up who have died for his laws unto everlasting life." "It is good (said the fourth) being put to death by men, to look for hope from God to be raised up again by him; as for thee, thou shalt have no resurrection to life." "Our brethren (said the seventh and last) who now have suffered a short pain, are dead under God's covenant of everlasting life; but thou through the judgment of God shalt receive just punishment for thy pride" (2 Mac. vii. 9, 14, 36). That this expectation was prevalent at the period for which we contend, is corroborated by the testimony of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is of the martyrs of the Maccabæan age that the words are spoken, "Women received their dead raised to life again; and others were tortured not, accepting deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection" (Heb. xi. 35). It is worthy of notice, that as the resurrection is the reward held out to the martyrs of the Syrian persecution by Daniel, so is the same recompence confined to the martyrs of the Neronian persecution by John. They who experience the "time of trouble" such as never was since there was a nation to that same time, are reproduced in those that were "beheaded" (*πεπελεκισμένοι*) "for the witness of Jesus and for the Word of God;" and they who "shine as the brightness of the firmament and as the stars for ever and ever," in those who "live and reign with Christ a thousand years."

From scenes of agonizing persecution at the hands of heathen tyrants, the former of whom appears to have been as desirous of subverting the Jewish religion as the latter of exterminating the Christian faith, these prophecies pass on to describe in parallel symbols the rescue to be effected by a mysterious deliverer, and the subsequent judgment and kingdom of the saints. This champion is set forth under the superhuman title of the "Son of Man," a title little known to the ancient prophets, but familiar to writers of the Maccabæan period. He rescues the Jewish people from their heathen oppressors; exalts them above all the nations of the earth; establishes a kingdom which

---

*erant malorum pondere, et quasi in sepulchris miseriarum reconditi, ad insperatam victoriam de terræ pulvere surrexerunt, et de humo elevaverunt caput custodes Legis resurgentes in vitam æternam, et prævaricatores in opprobrium sempiternum" (Hieron).*

"And there I saw one who had a head of days (the Ancient of days), and had his head white as wool. And beside him there was another whose countenance was as the face of a man; and his countenance was full of grace, like one

destroys and breaks in pieces all other kingdoms, and which lasts for ever. It may be interesting to compare the parallel passages in which these extraordinary ideas are expressed.

#### THE SON OF MAN.

"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the (a) Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him" (Dan. vii. 13).

#### THE JUDGMENT.

"The Ancient of days did sit . . . the judgment was set and the books opened . . . and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High . . . The judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end" (Dan. vii. 9, 10, 22, 26).

#### THE KINGDOM.

"And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed" (Dan. vii. 14).

"The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever; . . . and the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii. 18, 27).

The symbol of a "Son of Man (comp. Ezek. ii. 1) coming with the clouds of heaven" is peculiar to Daniel. But whatever interpretation may be given to it, it would be difficult to separate the period of this advent from that of the destruction of "the little horn." The events are united in point of time, and

#### THE SON OF MAN.

"And I looked, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat like unto the Son of Man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle" (Rev. xiv. 14).

#### THE JUDGMENT.

"I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them, . . . and I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it . . . and I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God, and the books were opened. . . . And the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books according to their works" (Rev. xx. 4, 11, 12).

#### THE KINGDOM.

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. xi. 15).

"And I heard a loud voice, saying in heaven, Now is come salvation and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ" (Rev. xii. 10).

of the angels. And I asked one of the angels who went with me, and shewed me all the hidden things about that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and why he went with the Ancient of days. And he answered me and said; This is the Son of Man who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hid; because the Lord of spirits has made election of him, and his lot before the Lord of spirits has exceeded all, through righteousness for ever. And this Son of Man whom thou hast seen will remove kings and mighty men from their places, and the violent from their thrones, and will loose the bands of the violent, and will break the teeth of sinners. And he will thrust kings from their thrones and out of their empires, because they exalt and praise him not, and do not thankfully acknowledge the source whence their empire is lent." (Book of Enoch.)



are immediately consequent upon one another. Daniel beholds "till the thrones" (the four great empires) "are cast down," and "till the beast (Antiochus) is slain, and his body destroyed and given to the burning flame" (vii. 9, 11); the coming of the Son of Man being contemporaneous with the destruction of the tyrant. The same order is elsewhere observed: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them *until* the Ancient of days came" (vii. 21, 22); the continuance of his persecution being arrested by the coming of the Ancient of days. And again, as they "take away his dominion to consume and to destroy it unto the end; the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, is given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (vii. 26, 27). It would appear also that the vision is limited with regard to the time of its accomplishment, and therefore its strong language is to be interpreted either of some great deliverer who, in the might of the Ancient of days, executed judgment upon the oppressor and at that time restored the kingdom to Israel; or else to be resolved into a vague expectation of Messianic and superhuman succour which, although falsified by the event, had the effect of sustaining the courage of the patriots against their persecutors. It is not improbable that the splendid successes of Judas may have laid the foundation for this extravagant theory of Jewish supremacy; and that an undue exaltation of feeling may have led an ardent people to substitute for an earthly warrior a "Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven," and for a temporal deliverance "an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and a kingdom which shall not be destroyed." The analogy between Daniel and the Apocalypse is maintained in the unique and extraordinary ideas presented by these symbols: "The Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven" is reproduced in the "Son of Man coming with clouds," or "sitting on a cloud" (Rev. i. 7; xiv. 14); and the "everlasting kingdom given to the people of the saints of the Most High" (vii. 27), in the everlasting reign of the "servants of God and the Lamb" (Rev. xxii. 3—5).

V. The analogy between the Apocalypse of the Old and the New Testaments is continued in the calamities brought by either persecutor upon Jerusalem; the temporary desolation of the city and sanctuary by Antiochus being repeated in the more fatal and permanent destruction which originated with Nero. This latter calamity, although executed by his subordinates Titus and Vespasian, may be referred to Nero; as the former, effected by Apollonius, may be referred to Antiochus. These analogous desolations are described in parallel terms.

## SYRIAN DESOLATION OF JERUSALEM.

"How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, . . . to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days" (Dan viii. 13, 14).

"The people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary . . . unto the end of the war desolations are determined . . . and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation" (Dan. ix. 26, 27).

## ROMAN DESOLATION OF JERUSALEM.

"Measure the temple of God and the altar and them that worship therein, but the court which is without the temple leave out, and measure it not, for it is given unto the Gentiles; and the holy city shall they tread under foot forty and two months" (Rev. xi. 1, 2).

"The great city which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified: . . . and the same hour there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city fell" (Rev. xi. 8—13).

Let this then be added to the rest, that an analogy is found to exist between the desolations brought upon the holy city by either tyrant. "The people of the prince that should come" of Daniel, are reproduced in "the Gentiles" of the Apocalypse, and the "treading under foot of the sanctuary and the host," is repeated in the "treading under foot of the holy city;" whilst the duration of the calamity "unto two thousand and three hundred days" (Heb. evening, morning=1150 days), finds an equivalent in the corresponding period of "forty and two months."

The two desolations are double one of another; the temporary calamity inflicted by the Syrian affording no inappropriate type of the permanent destruction of the Roman. The historical importance of this latter catastrophe sufficiently accounts for the desire to discover its prophetic announcement in the Book of Daniel. It was the great crisis for which the world was waiting.<sup>8</sup> In unequivocal language, which no sophistry can explain away, the Son of Man had announced his speedy advent to destroy Jerusalem, and to establish the kingdom of heaven before the generation which had heard his words had passed away. His apostles had reiterated his solemn threatenings. The Apocalypse had taken up the theme of an immediate catastrophe,

<sup>8</sup> "Si la première génération Chrétienne a une croyance profonde et constante c'est que le monde est sur le point de finir, et que la grande révélation du Christ va bientôt avoir lieu. Cette vive proclamation, 'Le temps est proche,' qui ouvre et ferme l'Apocalypse: cet appel sans cesse répété, 'Que celui qui a des oreilles entende,' sont les cris d'espérance et de ralliement de tout l'âge apostolique. Une expression Syrienne, 'Maran Atha,' 'Notre Seigneur arrive,' devint une sorte de mot de passe que les croyants de disaient entre eux pour se fortifier dans leur foi, et leurs espérances. L'Apocalypse écrite l'an 63 de notre ère fixe le terme à trois ans et demi. 'L'ascension d'Isaïe adopte un calcul fort approchant de celui-ci. . . . Jésus n'allait jamais à une telle précision; il disait que la date de ce grand jour n'est connue que du Père qui ne la révélée ni aux anges, ni au Fils, que se serait une surprise comme du temps de Noé et de Lot. . . . Mais ses déclarations sur la proximité de la catastrophe ne laissent lieu à aucune équivoque,'—'La génération présente ne passera pas sans que tout cela s'accomplisse.'—Renan.

# *Analogy between the Apocalypse*

and had rung out the knell of the old Jewish world. It ceases, therefore, to be a wonder that calamities described under such similarity of thought and diction, and reproduced under such agreement of circumstance and action, should have caused exegetical confusion; and that the Dromio-resemblance between the chief actors in the respective scenes should have led interpreters to explain the Syrian abominations of those perpetrated by the Romans, and the desolation of the city and sanctuary by Antiochus, of the destruction of the city and temple by Titus and Vespasian.

VI. In addition to the historical resemblance already traced in the scenes described by Daniel and John, minor points of verbal imitation give weight to the position that the second Apocalypse is to a great extent a transcript of the first. Among the ideas and expressions common, if not peculiar, to both, we may compare the somewhat egotistical "I Daniel" (Dan. viii. 15, 27), with "I John" (Rev. xxi. 2; xxii. 8). The confident appeal to veracity, "The vision which was told is true" (Dan. viii. 26; x. 21; xi. 2), with "These words are true and faithful" (Rev. xxi. 5; xix. 9). The unique idea, known only to the writers of Daniel and the Apocalypse, of "The Ancient of days, the hair of whose head was like the pure wool" (Dan. vii. 9, 22), with "The head and hairs white like wool and white as snow" (Rev. i. 14); "The judgment set when the Ancient of days did sit" (Dan. vii. 9, 10), with "The great white throne and Him that sat on it" (Rev. xx. 11). The "thousand thousands ministering unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before him" (Dan. vii. 10), with the "Ten thousand time ten thousand, and thousands of thousands" (Rev. v. 11). "The Son of Man coming with the clouds of heaven" (Dan. vii. 13), with "The Son of Man sitting upon a white cloud" (Rev. i. 14). "The dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him" (Dan. vii. 14), "The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of Lord and of his Christ" (Rev. xi. 15). "Michael the prince which standeth up for the children of thy people" (Dan. xii. 1), with "Michael and his angels fighting against the and his angels" (Rev. xii. 7). "The time of trouble, never was since there was a nation even to that same" (Dan. xii. 1), with "The great earthquake such as since men were upon the ground and stamping up of the host and stars to the earth" (Rev. xvi. 18). The stars of heaven and casting them to the earth" (Dan. viii. 10), with "The dragon drawing the thir of gods and Lord of kings" (Dan. ii.

ing,  
Dan.  
Rev.  
Kir  
2,  
com  
up  
1

"King of kings, and Lord of lords" (Rev. xix. 16). "The living God" (Dan. vi. 20), with "The living God" (Rev. vii. 2). "All whose works are truth and his ways judgment" (Dan. iv. 37), with "True and righteous are thy judgments" (Rev. xvi. 7). "Saints of the Most High" (Dan. vii.), with "King of saints" (Rev. xv. 3.) "The four winds" (Dan. vii. 2), with "The four winds" (Rev. vii. 1). "The four beasts coming up from the sea" (Dan. vii. 3), with "The beast rising up out of the sea" (Rev. xiii. 1). The "ten horns" (Dan. vii. 7), with the "ten horns" (Rev. xvii. 3). "The beast slain and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame" (Dan. vii. 11), "The beast taken . . . and cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone" (Rev. xix. 20). "The army of heaven" (Dan. iv. 35), with "The armies of heaven" (Rev. xix. 14). "Great Babylon" (Dan. iv. 30), with "Great Babylon" (Rev. xvi. 19). "The gods of silver and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know" (Dan. v. 23), with "Idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk" (Rev. ix. 20). The worship of "the golden image" (Dan. iii.), with "The worship of the image of the beast" (Rev. xiii. 15). "The four men loose walking in the midst of the fire . . . and the form of the fourth is like the (a) Son of God" (Dan. iii. 25), with "The Son of Man walking in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks" (Rev. i. 13). The command to "shut up the vision and seal the book" (Dan. viii. 26 ; xii. 4), with the converse direction, "Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book" (Rev. xxii. 10). The enigma proposed to the wise, "How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? . . . none of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand" (Dan. xii. 6, 10), with the equivalent, "Here is wisdom; let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast" (Rev. xiii. 18 ; xvii. 9) : and, lastly, the blessing of the resurrection, "Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days" (Dan. xii. 12) ; "when many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," with "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection ; on such the second death hath no power ; but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years" (Rev. xx. 6).

These parallelisms of thought and diction, to which may be added those of structure and arrangement, exhibit together so complete an analogy between the Apocalypse of the Old and the New Testaments as almost to compel the conclusion, that either the writer of the latter must have drawn largely from the

former, or that the respective authors intended to describe the same events. We give our adherence to the former of these theories, not only because it appears to have been the practice of the latter to avail himself of ideas borrowed from the ancient prophets, but because a strange similarity of style and subject demanded a similarity of symbolic representation. The earlier Apocalypse thus became the model of the latter, and the Syrian distress the type under which that of Nero found adequate expression. We are content to leave this parallelism<sup>4</sup> without further comment, simply observing that a similarity of symbolic representation would seem to demand similarity of exegetical treatment; and that as the visions of either prophecy have their consummation in the death of the tyrant,<sup>5</sup> so the interpretation of the latter would be circumscribed by that of the former; in other words, as the exegesis applied to the Book of Daniel cannot be extended beyond the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, that of the Apocalypse would be confined to the times of Nero. Both prophecies seem bounded by their own historical limits; and the introduction of an element of futurity into the interpretation of the latter, and the prolongation of its visions beyond the actual present or the immediate future of the seer, would create an eschatology for the second which is not discoverable in the first, and derange the harmony subsisting between them.<sup>6</sup>

P. S. D.

---

<sup>4</sup> It is worthy of notice, that in the parallelism between Daniel and the Apocalypse, the emblems of the latter are rather the result of imitation of style and figure than a correct delineation of the subjects which the author intended to portray. Thus the horns of the Roman beast are "ten," not because Nero is the tenth emperor, but because the Grecian beast of Daniel is furnished with "ten horns." The same beast is said to be "like unto a leopard, and his feet as the feet of a bear, and his mouth as the mouth of a lion," more for the sake of resemblance to the beasts of Daniel than exact conformity to the Roman empire. The second "beast coming up out of the earth with two horns like a lamb, and speaking as a dragon" (Rev. xiii. 11), is so described because "the little horn" Antiochus, comes up among the ten horns of the fourth Grecian beast, and in this horn were (two) "eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things" (Dan. vii. 8). The duration of the persecution of Nero "continues forty and two months, or a time, times, and half a time;" not because it extended over that precise period, but because it was that of the desolation spoken of by Daniel.

<sup>5</sup> According to Daniel, the Son of Man comes with the clouds of heaven at the juncture when "The beast (Antiochus) is slain, and his body given to the burning flame." According to John, "The Son of Man appears when the beast (Nero) is taken and cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." The reign of the saints with either prophet commences from the same period. According to Daniel, "The little horn makes war with the saints until the Ancient of days comes . . . and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." According to John, the millennial reign commences at the period when the beast is taken and destroyed (Rev. xix. 20; xx. 4).

<sup>6</sup> We should like to receive a temperate criticism of the preceding paper, for the views of which its author is of course alone responsible.—Ed. *J. S. L.*

---

### THE DECIPHERMENT OF CUNEIFORM INSCRIPTIONS DESCRIBED AND TESTED.

[Concluded from Vol. V., page 125.]

IN this second paper, we proceed to trace the progress of decipherment, (I.) in regard to the second and third species of the Persian trilingual monuments, and (II.) in regard to the more important records of Assyria and Babylonia.

I. In proceeding to use the key furnished by the first and simplest kind of writing on the Persian tablets, for the decipherment of the other two, it was only necessary to assume that the inscriptions composed in the latter were translations of those composed in the former; and this, no one who sees them occupying parallel columns in the same engraved tablets can reasonably doubt. Where a translation is used as a means of deciphering a piece of unknown writing, the procedure is simple in its nature, though usually demanding much patience and skill in practice. The proper names occurring in the known writing, when their equivalents are ascertained, and carefully determined and discriminated, furnish the readiest means of constructing the alphabet of the unknown. This alphabet, applied to the rest of the writing, gives the words in their forms and approximate sounds, for which again, at first collectively, and then discriminatively and singly, the known writing furnishes the approximate meaning. When, as often happens in such researches, the proper names do not contain a complete set of the characters employed, the powers of the characters left undetermined must be surmised, with more or less of evidence from variant orthographies, from the consideration of grammatical forms and analogies, with whatever rays of light may be furnished from other sources, as from kindred dialects or historical traditions. It happens that in both the second and third species of Persian cuneiform the number of characters to be determined exceed the means of determination presented in the proper names contained in the existing inscriptions, and this circumstance considerably lessens the serviceableness of the key given us by the translation of the first species. The second species has been found only on the monuments of Persia,<sup>a</sup> and only in two instances is it unaccompanied by a translation into the other two.<sup>b</sup> Some attempts at its decipherment were made

---

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Hincks regards the inscriptions of Mal-Amir as presenting a more ancient form of the same language. See *On the Polyphony of the Assyrio-Babylonian writing*, p. 16.

<sup>b</sup> The one instance occurs on the south wall of the platform at Persepolis, the other at Behistun.

by Münter, Grotefend, and others of the earlier inquirers. The first important work, however, on the subject, was written by the Danish scholar Westergaard, and published in 1844.<sup>c</sup> This work, for which the Behistun tablets were not available, did much for the determination of the characters, and pointed to remarkable conclusions, since fully confirmed, in regard to the linguistic affinities of the language. Westergaard's labours were reviewed, and, in some points, corrected and extended by Hincks, in 1846,<sup>d</sup> De Saulcy, in 1850,<sup>e</sup> and Holtzmann, in 1851.<sup>f</sup> A more complete work was published in 1853, in the *Journal of the Asiatic Society*,<sup>g</sup> by Norris. This scholar, having been entrusted with Rawlinson's new materials, accomplished for the second department what Rawlinson himself had done for the first, of the Behistun and other trilingual inscriptions of Persia, furnishing alphabet, grammar, and vocabulary, for the language there employed. Of more recent works on the subject, it is only necessary to mention a review, by Haug, of the work of Norris, published in 1855,<sup>h</sup> and a lengthened memoir, containing an independent investigation of the whole field, by Mordtmann, in 1862.<sup>i</sup>

The task of translating the writings composed in the second species, though comparatively easy after the translation of those in the first, presented some new and peculiar difficulties. The characters are much more numerous than those employed in the translated tablets, exceeding a hundred in number; and it was, therefore, to be at once concluded that they were syllabic rather than simply alphabetic in their power. A number of these characters it was found impossible to determine from the proper names in the inscriptions. Moreover, the careful application of the only key, the Persian version, and the transcription of the words according to the syllabic values thus ascertained, has brought out a language which is akin neither to the Arian nor to the Shemitic group of tongues, and for which congeners must be sought in the comparatively obscure and unstudied Turanian dialects of northern and north-eastern Asia.<sup>j</sup> This, it

<sup>c</sup> In the *Mémoires de la Soc. Roy. des Antiquaires du Nord*, 1844, p. 271—439; published also in German, along with the last Memoir of Lassen referred to in our previous paper, as a separate work, with the title, *Ueber die Keil-inschriften der ersten und zweiten Gattung*. Bonn, 1845.

<sup>d</sup> In the *Transactions of the Irish Academy*, vol. xxi.

<sup>e</sup> In the *Journal Asiatique*, 1850.

<sup>f</sup> In the *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, bd. v.

<sup>g</sup> See vol. xv., *On the Scythic version of the Behistun Inscription*.

<sup>h</sup> In the *Gott. gel. Anzeigen*, and separately.

<sup>i</sup> In the *Zeitschrift d. Morg. Ges.*, bd. xvi.

<sup>j</sup> This, which Westergaard and De Saulcy, as well as Rawlinson (*Asiat. Jour.*, x., p. 34), had surmised, has been fully established by Norris. Oppert

is manifest, greatly increases the difficulty of a full interpretation of the remains of this language. At the same time, I find in this remarkable and unexpected fact a new proof of the trustworthiness of that system of decipherment by which it has been elicited. For this is a circumstance which clearly shews that that decipherment is controlled by no preconceived theory as to what is probable or fitting. The language of the second order of the Persian trilingual tablets had been, by common consent, designated Median, in anticipation that it would prove Arian in its character, and would turn out to have been used by the Medes, well known as an important portion of the subject of the Achæmenian kings, whose language is presumed to have resembled that of the Persians. No one had conjectured its true nature till this was pressed upon the attention of inquirers as the result of the system we are now speaking of; and now, when this has been clearly demonstrated, scholars have been met by a new difficulty, scarcely yet fully solved, to discover historically the Turanian people by whom this language was used, and who, it is evident from the position these inscriptions occupy, must have formed no unimportant or uncultivated portion of the Persian empire. The entire spontaneity which has marked the reproduction of this Turanian tongue, characterized by all the leading peculiarities of the group to which it belongs, such as the aggregation without cohesion of auxiliary particles, the absence of gender in nouns, the law of collocation, whereby the subordinate or defining word precedes the defined,<sup>†</sup> renders of peculiar force the philological verification of the general truth of the decipherment. It is quite inconceivable that the characteristics of a Turanian language should have come out of these tablets of wedge-shaped signs merely by the application of powers to those signs derived from equivalent proper names, and without suspicion of the nature of the language, if the reading had not proceeded upon a sound basis.

The second species of the cuneiform writings of Persia, however curious and interesting to the student of ethnography and history, must yield in importance to the third species, through means of which the easiest and most direct access is opened to an acquaintance with the principal inscribed remains of Assyrian and Babylonian antiquity. Unfortunately, both is this species in itself the most difficult, and for its elucidation the most imperfect materials are furnished by the trilingual

---

says: "Il n'y a aucun doute, pour toute personne ayant quelque peu regardé le Medo-Scythique, que cet idiome ne sorte de la race finno-ouraliennne, qui se rattache à celle des Mongols." *Exped. Scient.*, ii., p. 82.

<sup>†</sup> As laid down, *e. g.*, by Prichard, *Researches*, iv., p. 384, f.



monuments. The characters are still more numerous and complicated than those of the second species, while on the Behistun rock the tablets containing the third or Babylonian version are so mutilated, that only the latter half of all the lines is now legible. The publication of these fragments, however, with a table of characters and a partial analysis, by Rawlinson, in 1851,<sup>1</sup> was the earliest important step towards the comprehension of the language. It had already, even at that time, been sufficiently evidenced by the researches of Grotefend, Hincks, Botta, De Saulcy, and others, in the extant remains of the Assyrio-Babylonian language, that these embodied a Shemitic dialect, and this was clearly shewn in the memoir referred to, while it has been fully confirmed by other more recent publications in the same department of cuneiform writing.<sup>m</sup> We have thus the same fact repeated which has been already noticed in connection with the other kinds of trilingual writing, viz., that a language bearing the characteristic marks of a certain group of tongues, in this case a group well known, and with analogies easily recognizable, comes out unforcedly by the application to those remains of the Grotefendian system of decipherment, and thus verifies the validity of the process by which it has been reproduced. As this department of the trilingual inscriptions of Persia has been studied almost exclusively in connection with the records on the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments, in which relation its chief importance lies, I go on to consider its bearing upon these, and the progress made in the reading of these larger and more interesting remains.

II. Those who believe that the right path has been struck for the interpretation of the engraved annals of Assyria and Babylonia, cannot fail to be impressed with the relations existing between the times in which the various discoveries have been made; and if our religious faith extends the oversight of Divine providence to the falling of a sparrow to the ground, it may well allow that its control is manifest here, in a matter so closely

<sup>1</sup> In the *Journal of the Asiat. Soc.*, vol. xiv. De Saulcy had published, in 1849, an *Analyse de l'Inscription de Hamadan et des Inscriptions de Persepolis*, of the third species.

<sup>m</sup> See, e. g., De Saulcy, *Traduction de l'Inscription Assyrienne de Behistoun*, in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1854-5, with other articles in the *Revue Archéologique*, etc. Oppert, in the Nakshi-Rustam inscription, in the *Zeitschrift d. Morg. Ges.*, xi., p. 136; and in his more recent works, *Expédition Scientifique*, tom. ii., and *Eléments de la Grammaire Assyrienne*. It is no valid objection to the Shemitic characters of the Assyrio-Babylonian language, urged by Renan and Schoebel (*Examen Critique du Déchiffrement des Inscriptions Cunéiformes*, p. 10, f.), that the system of writing is altogether unlike what we elsewhere find in Shemitic dialects. New facts are not to be refused because they are unexpected. Rather the unexpectedness of the result is a confirmation of the truthfulness of the system from which it emerges.

pertaining to the elucidation and establishment of the divine word. It has needed almost fifty years of diligent research on the part of many scholars to perfect the interpretation of the Persian trilingual inscriptions; and just about the close of this period, when the learned world had been furnished with the requisite key, the Assyrian palaces are exposed to view, and a new and vast store of wedge-shaped records is brought to light, relating to another people and another history more ancient and more interesting still than those of Persia. "The wonderful thing is," says Fergusson, "that just when the one discovery was on the eve of completion, the other was made to complete its usefulness: had either preceded the other, half of what is now known to us might have been lost from our not knowing what we were doing, or being careless of what is now of so much interest; but the one came with the other, and together revealed to us the records of a history that had been lost for centuries, and so completely lost that no man living even so much as suspected the possibility of their existence."

It gave new interest to the third column of the Persian tablets, when it was shewn that the complicated and uncouth combinations of wedges found there were reproduced, with only slight dissimilarities, in the large, and, in great part, recently discovered records of Babylon and Nineveh. The hope was thus awakened of finding in the former the desiderated key to the latter. Before the key could be tried, however, not a little preliminary work had been accomplished with these Assyrio-Babylonian documents.<sup>o</sup> The arrangement and comparison of the numerous characters had been attended to, their syllabic nature had been demonstrated, the apparent equivalence or power in the case of many of the signs had been pointed out, the Shemitic cast of the language had been shewn, and some important proper names, as Nebuchadnezzar, Babel, Sargon, had been more or less successfully determined. Sir Henry Rawlinson, as already stated, published his transcript of the third column of the Behistun inscription in 1851,<sup>p</sup> and since that time almost every year has seen new and valuable contributions made to our knowledge of the language and contents of

---

<sup>a</sup> *Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis*, p. 6.

<sup>o</sup> Of those who laboured on the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions before the publication of the Behistun text, the most distinguished are Grofetend, Hincks, Loewenstern, Botta, Longperier, De Sauley. An account is given of these earlier labours by Ménant, *Écritures Cunéiformes*, p. 120, f. Into the questions, in regard to priority of discovery, which have arisen among these and the other investigators, I desire not to enter.

<sup>p</sup> He had, in 1850, published a *Commentary on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Babylonia and Assyria*, based on his acquaintance with the Behistun record.

the engraved monuments of the Mesopotamian valley. It would be impossible, in any reasonable space, to give anything like a complete list of the several works published in this department. Besides Rawlinson himself, the scholars whose writings are of highest authority are Hincks, Talbot, and Oppert, the last of whom, in the second volume of his recent *Expédition Scientifique en Mesopotamie*, has furnished the most regular and complete work yet published on the Assyrio-Babylonian inscriptions. Another Frenchman, Ménant, has recently entered the field, and has printed some useful works. The publication of the original texts, an essential condition of progress in this study, is also being proceeded with, though too slowly for the impatience of some of the investigators. The largest and most important collection of original Assyrian writings is possessed by the British Museum, secured by the excavations of Layard, and his successors at Nineveh and elsewhere in the Mesopotamian valley. From this source emanated the volume entitled, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character, from Assyrian Monuments discovered by A. H. Layard, D.C.L.*, printed in 1851, and containing an important selection of documents. Another and still more valuable publication, drawn from the same ample store, is now going forward, edited by Sir H. Rawlinson, entitled, *The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*. From France, besides numerous detached inscriptions, we have a full edition of the inscriptions found at Khorsabad, in Botta's *Monument de Ninive*. Of these, a considerable portion has recently been published in a more accessible form, edited and translated by Oppert and Ménant.<sup>1</sup> It was the third compartment of the Achæmenian tablets which first introduced us to an acquaintance with the meaning of these deeply interesting records, and in this application its aid has been of invaluable consequence. At the same time, the means thus furnished have proved inadequate to effect a full interpretation of the many and long inscriptions now possessed. The remains of the Achæmenian writing present about one hundred and sixty different characters, and of these the proper nomenclature which they contain determine only about ninety,<sup>2</sup> while grammatical changes and flexions give the means of arriving at a probable opinion in regard to about twenty more. But when we turn to the Assyrio-Babylonian documents, we find the number of signs to which there is no direct clue greatly multiplied. Oppert, in 1858, gave a list of three hundred and eighteen characters, those known as "most in use," and the number

<sup>1</sup> *Les Fastes de Sargon, roi d'Assyrie, traduits et publiés d'après l'Assyrien de la grande inscription des salles du palais de Khorsabad, 1863*  
<sup>2</sup> See Oppert, *Expéd.*, ii., p. 34.

signs is  
many oc  
and Bal  
records  
try, d  
them  
ascer  
and  
rec  
th  
1

known must considerably exceed this. What is true of the signs is true also of the roots, of which, as was to be expected, many occur in the long and numerous inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia, which are not presented in the Achæmenian records. But, in addition to this accidental inadequacy of the key, difficulties of a peculiar and formidable kind have presented themselves to the students of these inscriptions. It was soon ascertained that the numerous characters had a syllabic power, and that the language possessed a very full set of the signs requisite to express syllables, both open and close. But, besides their phonetic value, it was found that a non-phonetic power also prevailed; that some of the signs were determinatives, indicating the class to which the word following them belongs; and that others of them were ideographs or monograms, representing things, not sounds, like our ordinary numeral characters. And still more, along with the recognition of these syllabic and non-phonetic powers, Hincks and Rawlinson, at an early period of the investigation, announced that they had found that many of the signs were also polyphonic, actually bearing, in different words, and sometimes in the same word, different syllabic values.\* These facts seemed to cast the study of these records into hopeless confusion. The difficulty of determinatives and ideographs is not, indeed, of an insuperable kind, and a precedent may be found for such phenomena in other alphabetic systems, specially in that of ancient Egypt. The polyphonic power, however, ascribed to many of the signs, appeared, if really existing, to bar all certain advancement, and to reduce the whole business of decipherment to an unguided play of fancy or conjecture. Serious doubt, rather entire disbelief, based chiefly on this ground, has been expressed, especially on the Continent, in regard to the whole procedure and results of what has been called the British school of interpreters.† It is to be observed, that the objections thus brought forward revolve round the *à priori* improbability of the polyphony of the signs in a language intended to be read, and possessing so great a variety of characters as the Assyrian, and mainly proceed from persons who have not themselves attempted the decipherment of these inscriptions. But *à priori* considerations, as already remarked in regard to a

---

\* Hincks, *On the Khorsabad inscriptions*, p. 15, f.; Rawlinson, *On the Babylonian and Assyrian inscriptions*, in *Jour. As. Soc.*, vol. xiv., p. 2. It was the opinion of Loewenstern, Botta, and, at one time, of Rawlinson (see his *Commentary*, p. 4), that there existed also homophones, *i. e.*, characters different in form, but having the same phonetic value. These, however, have disappeared before the more exact analysis of words and forms. See Oppert, *Exped.*, ii., p. 35; Ménant, *Écritures Cunéiformes*, p. 174.

† As by Ewald, Renan, Brandis, Schoebel.

kindred matter, cannot here be admitted to have any validity. In the case of one of the objectors, Brandis, an attempt has been made to read the inscriptions on the principle of strictly adhering to a mono-phonetic system, but his ill-success is manifestly so glaring as to discourage all perseverance in the path he has chosen."

There can be no doubt that the untoward but stubborn fact of polyphony renders much more difficult and embarrassing the task of reading these documents, and must seriously impede their complete decipherment. At the same time, it is not to be supposed that the polyphony of the characters of the Assyrio-Babylonian language is a thing unregulated and capricious: that every character has any value, or even that every value assignable to any polyphonetic character is indiscriminately to be suspected wherever the character occurs. Already, by the persevering efforts of the students of these writings, the laws and limits of the polyphony affecting the characters are beginning to be understood. It is found, that often by means of the "phonetic complement" the writing itself gives indications of its presence, and means of guidance in the selection of the proper phonetic power.\* There is also reason to believe that the signs are not universally polyphonous, and that a number of those most frequently employed are not liable to be affected by this ambiguity." Moreover, a most important discovery made by Mr. Layard, at Kouyunjik, has furnished new and valuable means for surmounting the difficulties which polyphony presents, and also for explaining the origin of this linguistic phenomenon. Among the chambers which he there laid open were two of comparatively small size, forming a repository of inscribed tablets and cylinders. "To the height of a foot or more from the floor they were entirely filled with them, some entire, but the greater part broken into many fragments. They were of different sizes; the largest tablets were flat, and measured about 9 inches by 6½ inches; the smaller were slightly convex, and some were not more than an inch long, with but one or two lines of writing. . . The adjoining chambers contained similar relics, but in smaller numbers. Many cases were filled with these tablets before I left Assyria, and a vast number of them have been found, I understand, since my departure. . . The documents

---

\* See his work, *Ueber den historischen Gewinn aus der Entzifferung der Assyrischen Inschriften*. Berlin, 1856.

\* See Oppert, *Expéd. Scient.*, ii., chap. 9; Hincks, in *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, Oct., 1855, p. 155; Jan., 1862, p. 404; *On Polyphony*, p. 33.

\* See Ménant, *Observations sur les Polyphones Assyriennes*, p. 9, f.; *Les Ecritures Cunéiformes*, p. 193, f.; cf. Hincks, *On Polyphony*, p. 32.

that have thus been discovered at Nineveh probably exceed all that have yet been afforded by the monuments of Egypt.”<sup>a</sup> These “record chambers,” the contents of which are now in the British Museum, have proved, says Rawlinson, “a real treasure-house of discovery. . . the *débris*, in fact, of the royal library.”<sup>b</sup> “It would seem,” remarks Oppert,<sup>c</sup> “that the unusual difficulties which are now felt in the reading of the old Chaldee monuments had already been felt by the literati of Nineveh in regard to their native system of writing, and it is thus intelligible how King Sardanapalus III.,<sup>d</sup> son of Esarhaddon, should have resolved to institute a clay library, which, as the inscriptions declare, might facilitate the knowledge of religion ;”<sup>e</sup> so that, by the fortunate preservation and recovery of these relics, we have been put in possession of the very means used by the later Assyrians to illustrate their own written language. Of the linguistic portion of these tablets (I borrow again from Oppert), “some are syllabaria, and explain short syllables by simple signs (*e. g.*, *kal* by *ka. al.*, *lip* by *li. ip.*, *muk* by *mu. uk.*), and append in a third column the Assyrian name of the object for which the syllable stands when used ideographically (*e. g.*, the character *at* is explained by *abu*, father ; *sis*, by *aku*, brother ; *gal*, by *rabu*, great). Others explain the verbal monograms, whose existence was before unsuspected (*e. g.*, *si* by *nadan*, give), and then follow the additions which *si* requires in order to become *iddin*, *inad-din*, *ittadin* (iftaal), *isaddin* (saphel), *istaddin* (istaphel). Others give the signification of several complex groups of characters, and that in a way which it would be impossible to demonstrate *à priori* (*e. g.*, *ut.*, *kip. rat.*, *ki.*, of which *ut* means day or sun ; *ki.*, city or land : *kip. rat.*, parts of the world, is to be read *Sippara*, the city of the sun ; but if the word river stands before this group, the whole is to be read *Purat* (*i. e.*, the Euphrates). These are the most important tablets. Others still are dictionaries of synonymes : one, *e. g.*, explains verbal roots by other roots,—*sarab*, burn, by *kavar* ; *kavar*, by *kalu*.

<sup>a</sup> Layard, *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 345, f.

<sup>b</sup> See *Report of As. Society*, May, 1853, p. 18 ; cf. *Report*, for May, 1856, p. 7.

<sup>c</sup> *Zeitschrift der Morg. Ges.*, x., p. 288.

<sup>d</sup> Called Asshur-bani-pal II., by Rawlinson.

<sup>e</sup> The inscription, in which the king declares the purpose of this collection, is thus rendered by Oppert, *Exped. Scien.*, ii., p. 362, cf. p. 53 :—“ Palais de Sardanapale, roi du monde, roi d'Assyrie, à qui le dieu Nebo et la déesse Tasmit ont donné des oreilles pour écouter, et des yeux pour voir, ce qui est la base du gouvernement. Ils ont révélé aux rois mes prédécesseurs les règles de cette écriture cunéiforme. Dans la piété envers Nebo, le dieu qui joint les caractères un à un, contrairement à leur valeur phonétique, je les ai écrites, je les ai signées, et je les ai rangées, puis je les ai placées au milieu de mon palais pour l'instruction de mes sujets.”

But the most interesting are the Scythic-Assyrian dictionaries, which give us the solution of the whole of this remarkable phenomenon."<sup>c</sup> This solution may be briefly stated thus:—The cuneiform characters, as was shewn in our former paper, are a degenerate kind of hieroglyphics, or representations of natural objects; and the inventors of these hieroglyphics were a people belonging to the Turanian or Allophylian stock, who spoke a language akin to that occurring in the trilingual tablets of Sardanapalus or Asshur-bani-pal, and also that of the second column of the Achæmenian inscriptions. But from its inventors the cuneiform syllabarium passed to other peoples, who adopted, perhaps with modifications, the characters, but adopted also, to a great extent, at least, the values they originally possessed, while attaching to them other values derived from their own vocabulary. "As there was but one picture-alphabet," says Rawlinson, "common to the whole aggregate of tribes, each character had necessarily as many phonetic values as there were distinct names for the object which it represented."<sup>d</sup> Thus, among the Assyrians, while the sign representing a fish had the power of *nun*, the Assyrian name, it had also the sound of *ha*, because the Turanian name began with this syllable. The sign for father, in Assyrian *ab*, bears also the power of *at*, from the original language.<sup>e</sup> There have been distinguished six languages, more or less different from one another, and used by different peoples, which are known to have employed the one cuneiform system of writing.<sup>f</sup>

1. The Turanian dialect found in the bilingual tablets of Nineveh (the Casdo-Scythic of Oppert).
2. The Turanian dialect of the second column of the Persian inscriptions (the Medo-Scythic of Oppert).
3. The Susianian found in the ante-Achæmenian monuments of Susiana.
4. The Armenian, on the rocks of Van and elsewhere in Armenia.
5. The Assyrian, from Nineveh and elsewhere in Assyria.
6. The Babylonian, from Babylon and elsewhere in Chaldea;

<sup>c</sup> See specimens of these bilingual tablets in Oppert, *Exped. Scien.*, ii., p. 96; Hincks, in *Zeitschrift der Morg. Ges.*, x., 516 f.

<sup>d</sup> See Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, i., p. 444, cf. Oppert, *Exped.*, ii., p. 69:—"N'oublions pas non plus que plusieurs idiomes s'écrivent avec le même système graphique que nous nommons *anarien*. Chez tous ces peuples, les mêmes signes ont la même valeur ideographique, et partout ce même caractère indique également le même son syllabique."

<sup>e</sup> See further details in Oppert, *Exped.*, ii., p. 78, f.

<sup>f</sup> From this enumeration the Arian, or Old Persian cuneiform, is excluded. If derived from the original hieroglyphical syllabarium, it is too purely alphabetic in its character to be ranked along with those mentioned in the text.

of the last the writing in the third column of the Persian inscriptions is a derivation.<sup>9</sup>

Further investigation and discovery may doubtless modify and correct the views thus set forth in outline, but the doctrine seems to rest on a sufficient basis of evidence, that the cuneiform syllabic signs, in passing from those by whom they were first employed into the hands of other races, retained their original phonetic value, and designated the same original idea, while gathering around them other values, mainly from the sounds expressive of that idea in the mouths of those by whom they were adopted. It remains to determine more precisely the geographical and ethnical relations of the remarkable people to whom so many tribes of the ancient world were indebted for the vehicle of literary expression,—of whom it can be said to be as yet only dimly ascertained that they used a language of Turanian character, and that they at a very early period were seated about the head of the Persian Gulf.<sup>4</sup> It remains also to ascertain how far the borrowing of the phonetic powers of the signs along with the signs themselves extended; whether it is found, as most seem to think, in all the derivative systems of writing, or whether, as Hincks holds, it marks only the Assyrio-Babylonian system.<sup>5</sup> These, and many other points of interest, await the progress of discovery. Meanwhile, as has been shewn, the suspicious and suspected fact of the polyphony of the characters of the inscriptions of Assyria and Babylon, has had both its reality established and its origin explained. All legitimate grounds of distrust in reference to the interpretations of those students of these inscriptions who receive this fact are removed, and at the same time, the means are found, in the linguistic tablets of Nineveh, of a full and certain comprehension of their meaning.

Meanwhile, though the right path has been struck, and no inconsiderable progress has been made in the work of interpretation, the labour of years will be required to perfect the reading of those large stores of cuneiform writing now accessible.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Oppert, *Zeitschrift der Morg. Ges.*, x., 804. *Exped.*, ii. 69.

<sup>4</sup> Norris, in 1853, expressed his conviction, from the study of the second Persian tablets, that "the Syllabarium was originally contrived for a Scythic language" (*Jour. Asiat. Soc.*, xv., 52. See Rawlinson, in *Athenæum*, Dec. 1855, and cf. the *Herodotus*, i., p. 442, n.). He would call the language of the inventors of the Syllabarium Akkadian, applying to them the term *Akkad*, frequently applied in the Assyrian inscriptions to a people of Southern Babylonia. Hincks, who is undecided in regard to the affinities of this ancient tongue, prefers the name Akkadian as involving no theory as to its cognation. See *The Personal Pronouns in their most ancient forms*, p. 3; cf. *On Polyphony*, p. 18. See in general Oppert, *Exped. Scient.*, ii., chap. vi.

<sup>5</sup> See Hincks, *On Polyphony*, p. 10.



Hitherto the Assyrian and Babylonian records have attracted, on several grounds, the principal share of the attention of the small band of scholars who have applied themselves to this department of study; those of Susiana and Armenia remain, so far as is known to the public, in all but their original obscurity, and a clue to their vocabulary is still to be discovered; yet the sure results already obtained fully reward all the labour and talent that have been devoted to the work of decipherment. In ethnography, in philology, in ancient geography and history, in political and religious antiquities, they present a great mass of new facts, opening up new fields of speculation, and setting up new landmarks, correcting many accepted views, and guiding into a more remote past the steps of philosophical research. Along with kindred and contemporaneous discoveries in the field of Egyptian antiquity, they must eventually lead to a great enlargement and reshaping of current doctrines in regard to the life, art, and religion of the ancient world, and of this not a few pledges have already been secured. The veil of myth cast by time upon the early history of mankind is being lifted off, and names and facts which had assumed, among later peoples, a fabulous magnitude and a false position, are being restored to their true place and proportions. The mirage which has so long haunted these desert regions will, we trust, be by and by dissipated, and the true features of the landscape come to view. In the department of human history, our science has made some steps of marked advance towards that beginning at which it can never cease to aim, and which, if it do not refuse the light which revelation offers, it may, in this department, possibly reach.

I conclude this paper, like its predecessor, by appealing to a few texts by which the renderings given by Rawlinson, Hincks, etc., of the Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform, may be verified. At the same time, I may here, in passing, obviate an objection of a general kind brought forward, with much confidence, against the validity of all such renderings. The late Sir G. C. Lewis<sup>1</sup> has laid down the doctrine, that when the tradition of a language has been lost it cannot be recovered: and as he has expressly applied this doctrine to cast discredit on the interpretations of the Egyptologists, we may be sure that he would equally have applied it to the efforts of that school of interpreters with which we have here to do. It is surprising that this author should have allowed himself to be imposed upon by a transparent ambiguity, the want of distinguishing between

---

<sup>1</sup> In his *Historical Survey of the Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 378.

loss absolute and loss partial. His reasoning is applicable only where the loss of tradition is absolute, and where no reminiscence of the language remains, either in proper names, or in the vocabulary of sister and daughter dialects. But in this sense, the loss referred cannot be predicated either of the language of ancient Egypt, or of those of ancient Persia and Mesopotamia. In any other less absolute sense, it is true of Sanskrit, Greek, Hebrew, and other ancient tongues now familiarly read.

Of considerations confirmatory of the truth of the results already obtained—1. I may urge, what has been already urged in regard to the Persian monuments, that such tests as exist of these results fully establish their general correctness. A few meagre bilingual legends have been found containing scraps of cuneiform writing with its equivalent in Phœnician characters, and these, so far as they go, furnish satisfactory confirmation. Such are the legends upon the Nineveh weights discovered by Layard.<sup>k</sup> Similar legends have been found on bricks from Babylon.<sup>l</sup> Last year, Sir H. Rawlinson wrote, "I have found that a considerable number of these tablets ('contract' tablets in the British Museum) have a memorandum in the cursive Phœnician character scratched upon their margin, intended, as it would seem, to assist the Nineveh librarian in the arrangement of the documents. These Phœnician legends are rude, and in many cases nearly illegible, but wherever I have been able to read them, I have found them to give the same names as are inscribed in the cuneiform character in the body of the tablet; the much-desired test of bilingual writing being thus at length obtained."<sup>m</sup> In some cases, the rendering of the epigraphs on the Nineveh bas-reliefs is found strikingly verified by the sculptural representations: as in the scene of torture from Kouyunjik, where the writing declares that "these men having spoken blasphemy against Asshur, the great god of the Assyrians, their tongues were pulled out,"<sup>n</sup>—in agreement with the picture. We can here

<sup>k</sup> See his *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 601. Norris, *Jour. Asiat. Soc.*, xvi., p. 215 f.  
<sup>l</sup> See Fresnel, in *Journal Asiatique*, Juin, 1853, p. 518. Cf. Levy, *Phönizische Studien*, ii., p. 23. The name of the parricidal son of Sennacherib, the Sharezer of Isaiah xxxvii. 38, is read by Oppert, from the cuneiform, *Asar-sarr-usur*. The hilt of his sword made of copper has been found at Khorsabad, bearing the legend in Phœnician אסרסר, as M. Lenormant at once read it, when the relic was submitted to the Académie by M. Place. See *Jour. Asiat.*, Fév.-Mar., 1857, p. 142.

<sup>m</sup> See *Athenæum*, February, 1863, p. 229.

<sup>n</sup> See Layard, *Nin. and Bab.*, p. 456 f. Another instance, p. 152. Of a rock tablet, near Korkhar in Armenia, containing a figure of Tiglath Pileser I., Mr. Rawlinson says (*Anc. Monarchies*, ii., p. 331, n.), "This monument, the earliest Assyrian sculpture which is known to exist, is mentioned by Asshur-

also use the tests already employed in another connection, and appeal, on the one hand, to the unforced emergence of many of the roots and forms of the Shemitic group of tongues from Assyrian and Babylonian documents;<sup>o</sup> and on the other hand, to the verifications which history affords. These are often very striking, and altogether inexplicable if the decipherment is arbitrary or deceptive. Thus Berosus relates that Nebuchadnezzar built one of the great structures of Babylon in fifteen days;<sup>p</sup> and the same statement is now read on his extant inscriptions in reference to his palace. Berosus further informs us that the Chaldeans used a peculiar numerical nomenclature, calculating by Sossi, Sari, and Neri, and this nomenclature re-appears in the cuneiform monuments. It is unnecessary to multiply such facts.<sup>q</sup> The general consistency of the readings, from the newly-discovered documents with admitted history, is acknowledged by all, and is daily receiving fresh illustration. This agreement is specially remarkable in the field of Jewish history, and if there are any to whom the 'cuneiform records and the Hebrew Scriptures are alike doubtful, they will find in their singular coincidence of statement a fact which ought to arrest their attention, which cannot be the result of chance, which certainly has not been the result of design on the part of the writers or decipherers on either side, and which only the hypothesis of truth on both sides can rationally account for.

2. The results obtained have accrued from the labour of independent and rival investigators. "There is a short proof which should suffice to inspire confidence in the general truth of these discoveries and results, and that is, that not only one laborious and indefatigable mind has applied itself, with all the aids that extensive learning and keen sagacity can supply, to the careful and gradual ascertainment of each separate letter and word, but that kindred spirits of energy, knowledge, and zeal, from Grotefend to Rawlinson and Hincks, have been sedulously engaged in the same task during a succession of years, and in places wide apart; and that the conclusions at which they have arrived in the progressive stages of research,

---

idanni-pal, the father of the Black Obelisk king, in his great inscription, and it was mainly in consequence of this mention, that Mr. John Taylor, being requested by Sir H. Rawlinson to explore the sources of the Tigris, discovered in 1862 the actual tablet, a circumstance which may seem to clear away any lingering doubts that still exist in any quarter as to the actual decipherment of the Assyrian inscriptions."

<sup>o</sup> See Oppert's *Grammaire Assyrienne*, *passim*.

<sup>p</sup> See *Berosi Fragmenta*, ed. Richter, p. 66. Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, ii., p. 587. Talbot in *Jour. Sac. Lit.*, January, 1856, p. 418.

<sup>q</sup> Cf. Bunsen, *Philosophy of History*, i., p. 199, f.

by their separate and independent operations, are generally accordant.” The manifold partial discrepancies in the results of the leading cuneiform scholars prove their mutual independence, and their mutual jealousies, often displayed, not without occasional acerbity of expression, give us equally the assurance that there is no collusion or compact to deceive; while agreement and disagreement alike prove the truth of the basis on which their operations proceed. The objection that these different inquirers, though mutually independent, and even jealous, yet go upon the same principles, and start from the same point, and that, therefore, it is to be expected they should reach the same results, is irrelevant. What if they found no other point to start from, no other road to take? The way of truth in this study may be narrow, but it is not the less truth that several unprejudiced and rival students agree to tread it together. Of the account and character of the agreement and difference actually existing in the results of these independent researches, the public have been afforded the means of judging by a competitive trial, instituted some time ago, between the four leading investigators, Rawlinson, Hincks, Talbot, and Oppert, in rendering a text previously unread. “Upon the whole,” says the late Professor H. H. Wilson, one of the judges in this trial, “the result of this experiment, than which a fairer test could scarcely be devised, may be considered as establishing almost definitely the correctness of the valuation of the *characters* of these inscriptions. . . . It is somewhat different with respect to the words of the language. The almost invariable concurrence of the translators in the general sense of the several paragraphs shews that they are agreed to give the same interpretation to a very considerable portion—if not the larger portion—of the vocabulary. At the same time the differences prove that much remains to be effected before the sense of every term can be confidently read.” This is a calm and just verdict. It is, at the same time, to be remembered that great progress has been made in the study since this trial was instituted, and a greater convergence of opinion on the part of cuneiform scholars might now be reasonably anticipated.

3. Nothing but the true system of interpretation could bring out self-consistent results in such a field of research. I have already urged their self-consistency in proof of the correctness of the translations from the Persian inscriptions; but the same fact may be much more strongly urged here. For here the

\* *Report of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1854, p. xvi.

\* See *Inscription of Tiglath Pileser I.* London, 1857. (Published also in *Jour. of Asiat. Soc.*, xviii., pp. 150—219).

number and variety of the extant inscriptions are greatly enlarged. They have been gathered from many different localities over a wide region: they have been found in many different situations, on slabs, on rocks, on statues, on cylinders, on bricks: they have evidently emanated from many different individuals and different peoples, and as evidently are to be dated from very different periods of time. This variety and multiplicity of the documents concur with the number and independence of the interpreters to give us a full guarantee of the general truth of the renderings. It is impossible for us to believe that a decipherment proceeding contemporaneously from several individuals, and agreeing to reduce these very numerous and multifarious records to one and the same self-consistent historical scheme (differences in detail not here coming into account),—a scheme which embraces the affairs of nations hitherto all but entirely unknown, and which stretches through many centuries covered heretofore with the midst of fable, can be the result either of chance or of deception.

W. T.



I have here sent you (my dear sister Katherine) a book, which altho' it be not outwardly trim'd with gold, or the curious embroidery of the artfullest needles, yet inwardly it is more worth than all the precious mines which the vast world can boast of. It is the Book, my only best, and best lov'd sister, of the law of the Lord: it is the Testament and last will which he bequeathed unto us wretches and wretched sinners, which shall lead you to the path of eternal joy: and if you with a good mind read it, and with an earnest desire follow it, no doubt it shall bring you to an immortal and everlasting life. It will teach you to live and learn you to die: it will win you more, and endow you with greater felicity than you should have gained by our woful father's lands; for as if God had prospered him, you should have inherited his honours and manors; so if you apply diligently this Book, seeking to direct your life according to the rule of the same, you shall be an inheritor of such riches, as neither the covetous shall withdraw from you, neither the thief shall steal, neither the moth corrupt. Desire with David, my best sister, to understand the law of the Lord your God; live still to die, that you by death may purchase eternal life, and trust not that the tenderness of your age shall lengthen your life; for unto God, when he calleth, all hours, times and seasons are alike, and bless'd are they whose lamps are furnish'd when he cometh, for as soon will the Lord be glorified in the young as in the old.—*Lady Jane Grey.*

### A RATIONAL VIEW OF HEBREW CHRONOLOGY.

THE present state of opinion respecting the chronology of the Bible is far from satisfactory. Several of those writers who, it is presumed, would not, on any account, be considered in the slightest degree enemies to revelation, have made such professions and admissions as appear to the writer of the ensuing pages calculated to shake the entire foundation of true belief, not only in that subject, but in the rest of Scripture. Grant that there are serious errors in the Bible, on one branch of its records generally, and it may be questioned whether it is possible to set any bounds to unbelief in any other point of its contents, but those which every man may be inclined to prescribe to himself.

---

If the celebrated English moralist had flourished in our time, he would have had no occasion to remark the paucity of those who take the trouble of thinking for themselves. His observations on life might have led him to a very opposite conclusion. He might with much more reason have complained that there are multitudes of all classes who decide very positively and very pertinaciously, of their own minds, questions on which they possess information very inadequate for forming a tolerable judgment. There is not an opinion, however sacred, but is disbelieved on all sides, upon very partial and superficial inquiry. If it were asserted, for example, that it is reasonable to believe that the world was created by an almighty and intelligent Being, and that He published to mankind a written system of divine instruction for the guidance of His rational creatures, from one state exposed to infinite misery, to another of as inconceivable felicity, it would be impossible to flatter ourselves that such opinions would not be met in some quarters with ineffable contempt. If it were further affirmed to be credible that the divine mind presided over the composition of the volume, so that it contains every doctrine and every fact which are necessary for the instruction of men in their preparation for an everlasting state of existence; and if it were, moreover, asserted that all which it does contain, from its beginning to its end, is reasonably believed to be almost unexceptionably a relation of truths and facts worthy of an infallible Being, without any disguise or concealment of knowledge, but such as might be expected to be observed within it, there exists a minority, though it is to be hoped a small one, in whom such opinions would excite a smile of scornful derision. In spite, however, of all this opposition of

science or philosophy, we embark on our enterprize in a firm conviction of the truth of these asseverations, and in the full belief in the existence of an ability in the world to defend them against all assailants, if it were necessary or expedient to encounter such a host of adversaries. And in the deepest persuasion that the Bible is inspired and perfect in its nature, barring slight errata which may have crept into the text through the inadvertency of transcribers, we resolutely declare that as it is highly credible, and would have been perfectly reasonable to anticipate, that God would cause a book to be written as the very best means that invention could devise of continually conveying divine information to successive ages of the world, so upon the same principle it is perfectly agreeable to reason to believe that the providence of God would take care to preserve the book from all errors of considerable importance for the benefit of those who would avail themselves of His wise and gracious provision for their salvation, and that in consequence, the book which has been delivered down to our times, and promises to survive for all future generations, is correct as well as true in all its particulars, except as far as the almost unavoidable inaccuracy of copyists may have introduced little more than inappreciable imperfections.

Much has very recently been written in support of this theory by very able champions of the truth on many points, but there is one subject on which little or nothing has been advanced, upon what may be called the orthodox and faithful side of the question, and it is hoped the following pages may supply an apparent defect in the publications of the times.

There is no more serious objection brought against the belief of the composition of the Scripture under divine influence than the discovery of any presumed internal contradiction to itself, or any similar inconsistency with undisputed phenomena of nature. It is under this conviction that certain appearances in the chronology of Scripture have been converted into arguments against its accuracy, and therefore against its veracity and inspiration. It is the design of this article to prove that it is worthy of belief that, in this very point of dispute, our Bible in its original language is to be depended upon as a narrative of truth.

Now it is alleged by writers, the grounds of whose opinion deserve investigation, that reasons exist which are sufficient to induce doubts upon the point of a very serious nature. The greatest stumbling-block in the way of an implicit confidence in the chronology of the Authorized Version of the Old Testament is the shortness of the period between the deluge, which is said

to have happened 2348 B.C., and certain events which are recorded in heathen and particularly Egyptian history. There are other objections, but of a subordinate character. It will facilitate a concise and clear discussion of these prejudices against the Hebrew verity if we classify them under the three following heads, which will include all the most important points necessary to be taken into consideration.

I. The chronology derived from the history and monuments of the Egyptians.

II. The arguments professedly connected with the Septuagint Version, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and the works of Josephus, and the testimony of early Christian, Jewish, and Pagan writers with reference to those particular authorities.

III. The supposed proofs contained in the Bible itself, of its own incorrectness considered relatively to extraneous evidences, and absolutely with its own revelations.

We will consider them, and we hope sufficiently, in the order of the above arrangement, but before we begin we will shortly describe one of our modes of managing the case.

It is not consistent with the brevity which we study, in this defence of our faith, to reproduce very much of the discourses of previous writers. We shall have to draw rather copiously from their statements, but it is no part of our intention to verify either the accuracy of their quotations or the fairness of their deductions. Opposite courses would neither be convenient to ourselves, residing at a distance from many books of reference, nor be, as it appears to us, by any means an indispensable expenditure of time and labour, nor tend to the production of a compendious and inexpensive treatise for all classes of readers. We do not vouch for the defensibility of every item we extract from the discourses to which we shall refer, but we shall accept the assertions of the most respectable writers, nothing doubting that they are correct in the gross; and as we shall treat both sides alike, in that respect, we shall not, we trust, be justly chargeable with undue partiality. We shall, where we think it necessary or expedient, dispute their inferences. We are answerable for nothing but what we maintain on our own authority, and it will be enough for us to form right conclusions from such premises as we deem a sufficient basis for human judgment.

I. Now, first, as to the Egyptian chronology compared with that of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. This chronology is represented as widely different from the Hebrew, and especially in a period of the Hebrew which is much disputed on other grounds. There are two ways of looking



at the matter. This chronological system may be regarded, abstractedly from the alleged disagreements, on its general claims to respect relative with those of the Hebrew system; and also on the respective titles to belief of the internal specific differences themselves. It will conduce to something like perspicuity if we confine ourselves, first, under this head, to the abstract consideration of these opposing claims, and reserve particulars to subsequent paragraphs.

Now, in viewing these two systems abstractedly from any of their internal differences,—*on the one hand* we behold, in the Hebrew, a chronology which professes at least to speak without ambiguity, and generally with great precision, a chronology of a most singular people and of a most extraordinary volume; a people who alone claim to have lived under the instruction and direction of the one true God, and a volume which claims to be composed by divine inspiration, and both whose demands have been allowed by the great majority, at least, of learned philosophers and divines: *on the other*, we see a system of chronology, dating from the remotest and darkest ages of antiquity, of a profane people of heathens and idolaters, who have been left entirely to their resources, negligences, and devices; a chronological system too of which its learned patrons confess, as well as its learned opponents proclaim, that it is very far, indeed, from precise, and so full of uncertainty, that it can with great difficulty be understood, in any intelligent manner, by all the ingenuity of its interpreters.

But this adverse statement to the Egyptian chronology, ascribed to its supporters and opponents, we must, before we proceed to other considerations, substantiate by competent evidence. And to this effect (we take his remarks nearly in their own order), one of the adherents of the Egyptian chronology declares, "The Egyptians do not appear to have had any common era. Every document that bears the date of a year, gives the year of the reigning sovereign, counted from that current year in which he came to the throne, which was called his first year (p. 505). Egyptian technical chronology gives no direct evidence in favour of the high antiquity which some assign to the foundation of the first kingdom. The earliest record which all Egyptologists are agreed to regard as affording a date is of the fifteenth century B.C., and no one has alleged any such record to be of any earlier time than the twenty-fourth century B.C. The Egyptians themselves seem to have placed the beginning of the first dynasty in the twenty-eighth century B.C., but for determining this epoch there is no direct monumental evidence (p. 506). The materials for historical chronology are the monu-

ments and the remains of the historical work of Manetho. Since the interpretation of hieroglyphics has been discovered, the evidence of the monuments has been brought to bear on this subject, but as yet it has not been sufficiently full and explicit to enable us to set aside other aid. We have had to look elsewhere for a general framework, the details of which the monuments might fill up. The remains of Manetho are now generally held to supply this want. (The three or four lines here omitted will be given subsequently.) The information Manetho gives us in the present form of his work is, however, by no means explicit, and it is only by a theoretical arrangement of the materials that they take a definite form. The remains of Manetho's historical work consist of a list of the Egyptian dynasties, and two considerable fragments, one relating to the shepherds, and the other to a tale of the Exodus. The list is only known to us in the epitome given by Africanus, preserved by Syncellus, and that given by Eusebius (p. 506, 507). These present such great differences that it is not reasonable to hope that we can restore a correct text. The earlier portion seems to represent parallel lines, the later a succession; the evidence of the monuments leads to the same conclusion,—kings who unquestionably belong to different dynasties are shewn by them to be contemporary. In the present state of Egyptology, this evidence has led to various results as to the number of contemporary dynasties, and the consequent duration of the whole history (p. 507). The evidence of the Egyptians as to the primeval history of their race and country is extremely indefinite. The absence of any important traditional period is very remarkable in the fragments of Egyptian history. These commence with the divine dynasties, and pass abruptly to the human dynasties. The latest portion of the first may, indeed, be traditional, not mythical, and the earliest part of the second may be traditional, not historical, though this last conjecture we are hardly disposed to admit. In any case, however, there is a very short and extremely obscure time of tradition, and at no great distance from the earliest date at which it can be held to end, we come upon the clear light of history, in the days of the pyramids. The indications are of a sudden change of seat, and the settlement in Egypt of a civilized race, which, either wishing to be believed autochthonous, or having lost all ties that could keep up the traditions of its first dwelling-place, filled up the commencement of its history with materials drawn from mythology.”<sup>a</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Smith's *Bib. Dict.*, art. *Egypt*, by Mr. Stuart Poole, p. 505—507, 507.

And, here, secondly, to continue our vouchers for the statement we have made as to the difficulty, if not impossibility, of extracting any intelligible and definite system from the chronological records of Egypt, another of the adopters of the Egyptian chronology, in preference to the Hebrew, makes the following acknowledgments: "The Egyptian monuments contain no continuous chronology, and no materials from which a continuous chronological scheme can be framed." [Adding, in a note, "the history of the dynasties preceding the eighteenth," says Mr. Stuart Poole, "is not told by any continuous series of monuments. Except those of the fourth and twelfth dynasties, there are scarcely any records of the age left to the present day."<sup>b</sup> M. Bunsen also says of the Egyptian monuments, "Such monuments cannot, indeed, compensate for the want of written history; even chronology, its framework, cannot be elicited from them."<sup>c</sup>] "The possibility of constructing such a scheme depends entirely upon the outline which has been preserved to us of the Sebennytic priest, Manetho, who composed a history of Egypt under the early Ptolemies. This outline is in a very imperfect condition, and the two versions of it, which we find in Syncellus, and in the Armenian Eusebius, differ considerably." "It is allowed on all hands by M. Bunsen, no less than by others, that no chronological scheme of any real value can be formed from Manetho's lists until it be first determined either which dynasties and monarchs were contemporary, or what deduction from the sum total of the dynastic years is to be made on account of contemporaneousness." "Even with respect to Menes" (the pretended earliest king), "and the supposed date of B.C. 3892" (Lepsius), "or 3623" (Bunsen), "for his accession; on what does it in reality depend?—not on any monumental evidence, but simply on the supposition that in a certain passage (greatly disputed) of Syncellus, he has correctly represented Manetho's views, and on the further supposition that Manetho's were absolutely right. But is it reasonable to suppose that Manetho had data for determining, with such exactitude, an event so remote, even if it be a real event at all, as the accession of Menes?" ("Whether Menes was an historic personage at all may reasonably be doubted. It is not pretended that he left any monuments.") "It is plain and palpable, and, moreover, universally admitted, that between the ancient monarchy (or rather monarchies) of Egypt and the later kingdom, there intervened a time of violent disturbance—the period known as the domination of the Hyksôs,—during which the native Egyptians suffered

<sup>b</sup> *Biblical Dictionary*, vol. i., p. 509.<sup>c</sup> *Egypt*, vol. i., p. 32.

extreme oppression, and throughout Egypt all was disorder and confusion. The notices of this period are so vague and uncertain, that moderns dispute whether it lasted five hundred, six hundred, nine hundred, or two thousand years. Few monuments belong to it. It is extremely doubtful whether an Egyptian of Manetho's age, honestly investigating the records of the past, could have carried on chronology, with any approach to exactness, beyond the commencement of the eighteenth dynasty, which effected the expulsion of the Hyksôs, or shepherd kings." "Let it be granted that Manetho honestly endeavoured to collect and arrange the lists of kings in the several states among which Egypt was parcelled out: what a task was before him! Royal monuments, or dynastic lists, of better or worse authority, might give him the names of the monarchs, and the number of years that each had borne the royal title. But, as 'association' was widely practised in Egypt, two or three, or even more, kings occupying the throne together, it would have been a work of extreme difficulty, without full and detailed records, which can scarcely be supposed to have generally survived the Hyksôs period; to make out, from the length of the reigns, the duration of any dynasty, and to determine what dynasties were contemporary, and what consecutive, would have been a still harder task. It is extremely doubtful whether Manetho really made any effort to overcome these difficulties."<sup>d</sup>

And now, thirdly, after having extracted enough, we think, from the writings of those who are most friendly to the Egyptian chronology, in defence of our assertion of its unintelligibility, to make that defence complete, one of the most learned and excellent opponents of that system, who has expressed his

---

<sup>d</sup> *Aids to Faith*. Rawlinson, *Pent.*, § 17. We subjoin, for the satisfaction of the curious, an account of the mode of reasoning by which a writer, who is so sensible of the imperfections of the Egyptian chronology, is induced, notwithstanding, to prefer it to the Hebrew. "Turning to the evidence of ancient history and tradition, we find the numbers of the LXX. confirmed rather than those of the Hebrew. The history and civilization of Egypt and Assyria, with Babylonia, reach to a time earlier than in the first case, and about as early as in the second, the Hebrew date of the flood, whence the numbers of the LXX., up to the deluge, would seem to be correct, for an accidental agreement can scarcely be admitted. If correct, are we, therefore, to suppose them original, that is, of the original text whence the LXX. version was made? This appears to be a necessary consequence of their correctness, since the translators probably were not sufficiently acquainted with external sources to obtain numbers either actually or approximatively true, even if they externally existed, and, had they had this knowledge, it is scarcely likely they would have used it in the manner supposed. On the whole, therefore, we are inclined to prefer the LXX. numbers after the deluge, and as consistent with them, and probably of the same authority, as those before the deluge."—*Biblical Dictionary*, p. 320.

thorough contempt for the authority of the monuments, and of Manetho himself, in a long dissertation (much the greater part of which would well repay the labour of perusal), takes, so to speak, for the text of his discourse, this very remarkable passage from Eusebius: "We are directly informed by him," says he, "that Manetho voucheth this as the main testimony of his credibility; that he took his history from some pillars in the land of Seriad, in which they were inscribed in the sacred dialect by the first Mercury Thoyth, and after the flood were translated out of the sacred dialect into the Greek tongue, in hieroglyphics, and are laid up in books among the revestries of the Egyptian temples, by Agatho-dæmon, the second Mercury, the father of Tat."<sup>e</sup>

So much for confessions and declarations, touching the subject in debate, proceeding from opposite partizans.

Now, without thinking at this moment what are the special internal differences between these two authorities, the Hebrew and the Egyptian chronology, that we may come to the point at issue immediately, to prefer the chronology of the Egyptians to that of the Hebrew Bible, is to give the preference to profane vague traditions descending from the earliest and darkest periods of heathenism, over a definite chronology which has strong pretensions to divine authenticity; and we assert that on this *primâ facie* view of the case, it is a preposterous preference, or, at least, a preference not agreeable to reason. We maintain that it is neither more nor less than reasonable, if we consider the comparison thus abstractedly, without examining the internal claims of either system, to believe the book which has almost universally established among the learned its title to divinity, rather than the works of unassisted heathens, and more particularly of a nation proverbial for mysticism, however ingenious they may have been in any of the arts of life, during the primitive ages of antiquity.

We know that it is alleged, even by one of those anti-Hebraist writers whom we have already cited, that a comparison with the monuments has shewn that Manetho drew his information from original sources, the general authenticity of which is vindicated by minute points of agreement;<sup>f</sup> and by the other, that Sir Gardner Wilkinson inclines to place the accession of Menes about B.C. 2690,<sup>g</sup> and that both the versions of Manetho's list agree in representing Egypt as governed by thirty dynasties of kings from Menes to Alexander, and the sum of the years which

<sup>e</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet's *Orig. Sac.*, ii., 11.

<sup>f</sup> *Bib. Dict. Egypt. Hist. Chro.*, p. 506.

<sup>g</sup> *Aids to Faith. Pent.*, p. 256.

they assign to these dynasties is a little above (or a little below) five thousand, and that the monuments have proved, with respect to those lists of Manetho, that (speaking generally) they are historical—that the persons mentioned were real men, who actually lived and reigned in Egypt.<sup>a</sup>

But from these proofs of the reality of the persons, and of the truth of the records of Manetho, in consequence of their agreeing with the monuments, we are constrained most entirely to dissent. Indeed, only one page after this profession, the latter writer has avowed that it may reasonably be doubted whether there ever existed such a king as Menes.<sup>i</sup>

The concurrence of Manetho's list, and of the monuments, certainly proves one thing. It proves the truth, in part, of what we have but this instant read concerning him from Eusebius, that he obtained his information from the monuments. And it shews further, that his records of dates are not of independent authority; that they are of no more value than the testimony of the monuments; and that the authenticity of his dates and facts depends entirely on the pillars; that of those of the pillars, agreeably to his own attestation, depending on the god Mercury. So indefinite and uncertain, not to say fabulous, must be much of the Egyptian system resting on these foundations. We cannot ourselves, for the life of us, perceive the wisdom of opposing to the God of Heaven the heathen god Mercury, as of superior authority; nor to the book of Genesis, and its definite records, the most probably mythical traditions of the obscurest antiquity in defence of dates inscribed on pillars, nobody knows when, and by nobody knows whom.

We deem it, on the contrary, perfectly reasonable to prefer the chronicles of Moses to these authorities on this abstract view of the case, and to maintain that preference; unless, on internal examination, the system of the Hebrew must appear to be indisputably incorrect, and can be truly understood only in agreement with what may be shewn by some legerdmain to be the Egyptian theory.

But we can perceive no necessity for either of these hypotheses. We have stated that the difficulty in the minds of our opponents lies in the Hebrew date of the deluge (2348 B.C.), not affording, in their judgment, a sufficient length of time for the origin and progress of Egyptian arts and civilization. We believe, on the contrary, that the two thousand years which, on the assumption of that date, must have expired before the age of Manetho, and nearly the same interval which preceded the

---

<sup>a</sup> p. 253.<sup>i</sup> *Aids to Faith. Pent.*, p. 254, and note.

history of Herodotus, was an abundant space for a heathen nation to have wandered in mythological error, without the light of history, and, according to the Bible, to have commenced vast works of art and ingenuity at even an early point of that protracted era. For we see, on the authority of our Sacred Volume, that the immediate progeny of our first forefather were probably inspired by God with a knowledge of various arts necessary for their comfort and convenience; and we deem it probable that, as far as was requisite, the same blessings were bestowed on the descendants of the first family who survived the flood. But our authority, in other respects, exceeds probability. We observe, that that family must have possessed great knowledge of at least naval architecture, and that when, probably, little more than two centuries had elapsed from the time of the construction of the ark, the people presumed on the skill to design and to execute the most ambitious of human edifices. We perceive also, from the same records, that the population of the earth, by virtue of the longevity of man, related in the eleventh chapter of the book of Genesis, might have been soon after increased to hundreds of thousands, and have, in a great proportion, migrated, on the general dispersion, to a land where they indulged their lofty aspirations in the erection of those pyramidal structures which are the wonders of the world, and of other monuments which bear the inscriptions of a fabulous antiquity.

We are, therefore, not obliged, in this case, to have recourse to any alteration of dates to reduce our Bible to consistency, and the Egyptian progress within the range of credibility. And as there is no insuperable objection to the accuracy of the Hebrew record, we hold it reasonable for Manetho to yield the palm of truth to Moses, and the monuments of Egypt to renounce all pretensions to rival the veracity of the book of Genesis.

II. If the slightest preponderance inclines the Egyptian scale, it must be owing to the addition of matter derived from extraneous authorities. Such authorities are alleged to exist in the works of Josephus, the Samaritan Pentateuch, and most especially in the Septuagint version of the Hebrew Bible. These are all witnesses against the original of the authorized English translation.

It would be thought, probably by persons acquainted only with the origin, the age, and the reception of the Septuagint, with the genuineness of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and with the credibility of Josephus as an historian, that their united opposition to the Hebrew text, in any particular department, must be sufficient to excite, at least, reluctant doubts of its accuracy in the mind of the believer. They might naturally expect that

they were witnesses in perfect agreement against the disputed original, and that they were each of them of very credible integrity. And, no doubt, if no evidence could be discovered against the purity of their own texts, and if they were all united in their testimony against our Hebrew Bible, their reputation and agreement would cast a shade of discredit upon its fair pretensions. It would not be easy to see how we could reasonably place secure reliance upon the correctness of the Hebrew text on the points in dispute, except by suspecting that there was some conspiracy in early times against its system. But nothing can be well further from the truth than either of these suppositions. The three opponents to the Hebrew text are, none of them, above not suspicion only, but disbelief. They are all open to very serious charges of corruption. Veracious as Josephus is as an historian, and correct as he probably was originally as a chronologer, his text, at the present day, is, in the latter respect, proverbially full of inaccuracies. Professor Faussett very properly pronounces it "a mass of confusion and inconsistency."<sup>4</sup> That the Samaritan Pentateuch again has been tampered with is so certain, that Bishop Walton does not hesitate to reflect on the idea of the purity of its text with derision and contempt;<sup>5</sup> and even Dr. Hales presumes that he has detected in it the grossest forgeries in chronology itself.<sup>6</sup> We are inclined to be little less sparing in our censure of the text of the Septuagint; but are contented, at the present moment, only to observe that one of the most startling and convincing facts in connection with these three witnesses against the Hebrew verity is, that they all differ very materially from one another in the controverted points of its chronology. There are not two of the witnesses that "agree together." Two, at least, of the three most certainly have been corrupted on the very article in question. Their contradictory testimony would be fortunate to escape, in a court of justice, a prosecution for perjury, and will not be, for a moment, allowed at the bar of our own conscience.

But, though we dismiss these three witnesses thus summarily in their collective capacity, it must not be concealed that most strenuous efforts have been exerted to establish the claims of the Septuagint individually above all its competitors, including the Hebrew itself. The Septuagint allows six or seven hundred more years than the Hebrew for the indulgence of Egyptian imaginations, and is, in short, the pretended assertor of chronological truth, agreeable to its literal emanation from its divine

<sup>4</sup> *Sac. Chron.*, p. 23.

<sup>5</sup> *Prolegom.*, xi., 17.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. Chron.*, vol. i., § ii., v., 1.



Author. It is contended that the Hebrew text was much more likely to be corrupted than that of the Septuagint, and on arguments which may certainly appear very convincing, if they are considered separately from any objections to which they are justly liable, but appear to us no less certainly almost as light as air when examined by those equitable criterions.

We believe that we shall do full justice to the cause of our opponents, if we display to the reader all the most formidable attacks on the Hebrew chronology of probably the most determined and most laborious of its assailants.

He asserts that (1.) "the inspection of various editions and the copious collations of the Hebrew text, with a great number of MSS. collected from all parts of the world by the laudable industry and extensive researches of Kennicott and De Rossi, and other learned men, have proved that the sacred classics are no more exempt from various readings than the profane; (2.) that *hence* the Hebrew copies are equally obnoxious to adulteration as the Greek; (3.) but that the Hebrew copies afforded greater facilities and opportunities of adulteration than the Greek, for in the course of the Jewish war, until the final destruction of Jerusalem, and expulsion of the Jews from Judæa in the reign of Adrian, vast numbers of the Hebrew copies must have been lost or destroyed, besides those that were taken away by the conquerors among other spoils, and the few that were left were confined in great measure to the Jews themselves, as the Hebrew language was not in general use like the Greek. Whereas of the Greek copies, even if all that were possessed by the Hellenistic Jews, not only in Palestine but throughout the world, had been destroyed, which was far from being the case, yet the copies of the LXX. in the possession of the Christians everywhere rendered any material adulteration of the Greek text, at least in so important a case as that of the genealogies, well nigh impossible; (4.) also, the temptation to adulteration was greater in the Hebrew than in the Greek, after the first destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, A.D. 70, the Jews were so oppressed by their national calamities that they could think of nothing else for a time, but about the end of the first century of the vulgar era they were roused to oppose the wonderful progress of Christianity. What principally excited their rage and vexation was, that their own Scriptures were turned into artillery against them, to prove that Jesus was indeed the Christ from the days of the apostles (Acts xviii. 28). In order to bring the Septuagint Vulgate version, which was usually referred to by the Christians, into disrepute, amongst other things mentioned, they set up three other Greek versions in opposition thereto from

their curtailed Hebrew text;<sup>k</sup> (5.) the motive which led the Jews to mutilate the patriarchal genealogies is most clearly exposed by Ephræm Syrus, who died A.D. 378. "The Jews," says he, "have subtracted six hundred years from the generations of Adam, Seth, etc., in order that their own books might not convict them concerning the coming of Christ; he having been predicted to appear for the deliverance of mankind after 5500 years;"<sup>l</sup> but although the corruption of the Hebrew genealogies began as early as Aquila's version, A.D. 128, yet it does not appear to have made any considerable progress for two centuries after. Indeed, the shorter computation did not prevail in the Hebrew Bibles until a good while after his death, for Eusebius, who died A.D. 340, "found in the Hebrew copies which he consulted, different accounts of the times, some following the longer, others the shorter computation."<sup>m</sup>

Now we hope it will not be deemed affectation to disown that this array of allegation has to us the least alarming appearance. In defiance of it all, we hesitate not to contend that it is much more reasonable to believe that the Septuagint was altered from the short to the long computation, as it is called, than the Hebrew in the reverse direction.

We esteem it, in the first place, a "scant measure" of equity to pronounce on the text of the Hebrew, as revised by Kennicott and De Rossi, the judgment we have repeated,—that "the sacred classics are *no more* exempt from various readings than the profane." It leaves, at least, the general reader at perfect liberty to imagine that those learned men may have discovered that that text has been exceedingly corrupted. It does not inform him that, considering the innumerable minute peculiarities of the Hebrew character, and the vast extent of the collations of those Hebrew scholars, it is almost wonderful that the number of differences in the text has been so small; and more certainly still, that they have been, with very few and slight exceptions, of such insignificant import," so that "no work has descended to the present day so free from alteration as the Hebrew Bible."<sup>n</sup>

But the next assertion, that "*hence* the Hebrew copies are equally obnoxious to adulteration as the Greek," does much greater violence to our convictions, both as *an inference* from the former, and in the measure of its comparison of the two authorities. We maintain, on the contrary, that the Greek has been much more obnoxious to adulteration than the Hebrew,

<sup>k</sup> Hales's *Anal.*, vol. i., pp. 275, 276.

<sup>l</sup> Vol. i., p. 278.

<sup>m</sup> Hales's *Anal.*, vol. i., p. 278.

<sup>n</sup> Bishop Marsh, *Lect. ix.*, 221—223.

<sup>o</sup> *Ibid.*, *Lect. i.*, 57.

from the circumstances by which it was surrounded, and from the contrast between them actually observable.

The reader is requested to understand, and to retain in memory, that the Septuagint version of the Old Testament was incomparably more used among both Jews and Christians, in the age to which our attention is directed, than the Hebrew original. The numbers of the people who could read the one and not the other were beyond measure disproportionate. It may be perfectly true that the facilities for the corruption of the Hebrew were greater than for the corruption of the Septuagint, inasmuch as the number of copies to be altered was immeasurably less; the copies also were much more concealed from public observation owing to the prevalent ignorance of the language in which they were written; and as they were in the hands of a few, their adulteration might the more easily escape detection. But whatever might be the excess of "*facility*" on one side, there was far more "*temptation*" to adulterate that version than the sacred text which it professed to interpret, and most certainly there was facility enough in all conscience for taking liberties in its depravation. In the first place, as to the "*temptation*" to vitiate. It has been urged that the Jews, at the commencement of the Christian era, were vexed and enraged that their own "Scriptures were turned into artillery against them, to prove that Jesus was indeed the Christ, from the days of the apostles" (Acts xviii. 28). To avoid confusion of ideas, in this instance it is necessary to observe that it was through the medium of the Septuagint that almost all this annoyance to the Jews was effected by "*their own Scriptures.*" The Greek, not the Hebrew, was the powerful instrument of conversion and edification to Jew and Gentile. It was the Greek, too, from which it must have been the desire of the Christian to derive instruction. If there were any temptation at all to alter in any way the Old Testament, among either Jews or Christians, it must be the Greek translation, upon which all imaginary corrections or improvements would be made. There could be little or no temptation to alter the Hebrew, which might be said, by fair comparison, to be laid upon the shelf.

And, secondly, there was probably as much "*facility*" as temptation. In spite of the notoriety of the Greek version, there most unquestionably was at least *sufficient* facility for its being adulterated to an indefinite extent. There certainly was this facility, because it is universally admitted that alterations in the text of the Septuagint were very considerable, both in number and significance. It was in a very corrupted state that the text of that volume came into the hands of one of its most

learned correctors. When Origen "observed differences between the Hebrew and the Greek, he does not appear to have suspected that those differences arose from any other cause than alterations in the latter."<sup>p</sup> A learned writer also of the present day,—an advocate of the Septuagint chronology,—admits in a treatise on that particular subject, that "with respect to the probability of accuracy arising from the state of the text, the Hebrew certainly has the advantage, and that the text of the Septuagint shews signs of a carelessness that would *almost permit change*;"<sup>q</sup> and not to multiply authorities on a point which is indisputable, even Dr. Hales (who makes a most inadvertent misapplication of the testimony in direct opposition to its plain signification) has produced the evidence of Justin Martyr, as to several alterations or erasures by the Jews of the prophecies relative to the *divinity*, *passion*, and *death* of Christ, out of the copies of the Septuagint Vulgate version used in their synagogues. "Your rabbis," says he to Trypho, "have absolutely expunged many passages out of the Septuagint version, as I would have you to know. Still I will argue with you even from those received passages which ye admit, which, if your rabbis had understood, be assured they would have expunged them."<sup>r</sup>

It certainly has been "conjectured" and believed by Ephræm Syrus, a Christian bishop of the East, who died about 378 A.D., that the alterations of the chronology of the Old Testament were made by the Jews in the original. His words are: "The Jews have subtracted six hundred years from the generations of Adam, Seth, etc., in order that their own books might not convict them concerning the coming of Christ, he having been predicted to appear for the deliverance of mankind after 5500 years."<sup>s</sup>

This passage in his writings refers to a constructive prediction of the Jews and Christians about the time of Christ. It was believed by the cabbalistic Jews and by Christians, partly on the six days of the creation being followed by the day of rest, and on the superstitious notion that the six alephs in Gen. i. 1, signified the six thousand years before the advent, which was an element in the so-called millenary theory. This theory was much believed by primitive Christians of distinction. Ephræm Syrus appears to have been one of its adherents. He would then naturally believe in the Septuagint chronology, and might have been easily induced to lay its adulteration in the Hebrew to the charge of the Jews. But it is acknowledged by one of

<sup>p</sup> Bishop Marsh, Lect. i., 57.

<sup>q</sup> *Bib. Dict. Chron.*, p. 320.

<sup>r</sup> Hales, vol. i., p. 277. Justin Martyr Trypho, near the end of first day's dialogue.

<sup>s</sup> Hales, vol. i., p. 278.

our most learned and judicious opponents, that "the cause of the alterations is most uncertain. It has indeed been conjectured," he says, "that the Jews shortened the chronology in order that an ancient prophecy, that the Messiah should come in the sixth millenary of the world's age, might not be known to be fulfilled in the advent of our Lord. The reason," he adds, "may be sufficient in itself, but it does not rest upon sufficient evidence."<sup>†</sup>

Now we venture to assert that it is *much more reasonable* for our contemporaries to *conjecture* that the chronology of the Septuagint was altered by the Alexandrian Jews, to adapt their system to the Egyptian pretensions to antiquity, and by primitive Christians to make the system agree with the commonly received prediction, on three accounts most especially:—

1. Because it can be perceived with a little ingenuity, by an examination of the text, what were probably the motives which urged them to each particular change of the disputed passages;" 2, because we know that the Septuagint was corrupted in a great degree; and 3, because it is acknowledged by friends and foes, that the Hebrew text was preserved by the Jews with the most religious care and scrupulous exactness."

It may be thought that an objection to the Hebrew text, which remains unnoticed, is alone fatal to its credibility. It appears impossible not to believe that Hebrew manuscripts of the longer computation did exist in some part of the first centuries of the Christian era, because Eusebius, who died A.D. 340, found in the Hebrew copies which he consulted different accounts of the times, some following the longer, others the shorter computation."

But this statement may be admitted to be true without the slightest invalidation of our argument. It may be that in those early days some copyists were found who would trifle with the Hebrew in its dates, as well as others with its versions—exceptions were discovered to the general rule. But this is a matter of no serious consequence. The great point for consideration is not what contradictions of the Hebrew might exist in the commencement of our era, but the singular agreement which belongs to those copies that have been actually transmitted to posterity

<sup>†</sup> *Bib. Dict. Chron.*, vol. i., p. 319.

<sup>\*</sup> Faussett, *Sac. Chron.*, chap. 1.

<sup>•</sup> *Josephus contra Apion*, i. 8. *Bib. Dict. Chron.*, p. 320. Poole, "with respect to the probability of accuracy arising from the state of the text, the Hebrew certainly has the advantage. There is every reason to think *the* rabbins have been scrupulous in the extreme in making alterations." Also Marsh, *Lect. i.*, 57.

<sup>•</sup> Hales, vol. i., p. 278.

through succeeding generations. It is very probable, and not to be wondered at, that there were Jews, and Christians likewise, who were nothing loth to alter the Hebrew to suit their purposes, as well as the Greek, when they had the opportunity. But it is very well known that there have existed in every age of the Christian dispensation most vigilant and careful guardians of the integrity of the Hebrew text, in all its essentials, to as great an extent as was compatible with their powers. There were the learned Jews of Tiberias, the Karaïtes, and the later Masorets. "Tiberias, in Galilee, was the seat of Jewish learning. It was the residence of the best Hebrew scholars, the repository of the best Hebrew manuscripts." The learned Jews of Tiberias in the third and fourth centuries must have had access to Hebrew manuscripts which were written before the birth of Christ. We know that they sought and collated them. "We know that their exertions to obtain an accurate text were equal to their endeavours to preserve it." The materials of Jewish criticism are contained in the Masora. "This collection was formed at Tiberias." In what century it was begun is not positively known, but certainly not sooner than the fourth, and probably not sooner than the fifth century. "That the integrity of the Hebrew text, from the time when it was fixed by the authors of the Masora, has been as strictly preserved to the *present* age as it is *possible* to preserve an ancient work, is a position which no longer admits of doubt." And as to the Masoretic text being itself an accurate copy of the sacred writings, the author from whose works we are making these extracts, taking into consideration what is known of the labours of these learned Jews, asks, in conclusion, "Why then shall we conclude that they laboured in vain?"<sup>z</sup>

There is no reason for believing that any interval intervened in which one or other of these most loyal votaries to divine truth have not watched over and preserved with the greatest jealousy the purity of the Word of God. They, the Jews of Tiberias, the Karaïtes and the Masorites, may reasonably be believed to have been instruments in the hand of Providence, of transmitting from century to century, and, except in early times, without any co-existing adulterations, the Jewish Scriptures to ourselves in their substantial originality.

III. We commence another stage of our discursory journey by venturing to assert, that if there is any extant matter for the refutation of the Hebrew verity, it is to be found in internal disagreements of the Bible with facts, and in its inconsistencies

---

<sup>z</sup> Marsh, Lect. ii., pp. 64, 65; Lect. ix., pp. 223, 224.

with itself. And it appears to be imagined by some persons, that unanswerable accusations have been preferred against it of these very kinds. We have no hesitation in professing ourselves not among the discerners of those difficulties. We doubt not they are inventions rather than discoveries. We hope our eye is single. It will be well however to consider a little, at least, the chief objections which have been urged with the greatest vehemence, and which appear to have produced conviction, in some instances, on learned minds.

Several of these objections we feel it almost a condescension to notice after the answers which those of them that have ever required answer, have already received. We mean particularly Dr. Hales's "glaring anachronism" (vol. i., p. 220), which we refer to Faussett (p. 15), and his "dishonest management" of 410 years, which we scarcely know whither not to refer for its correction to 424, and his "centenary addition" still found in the sixth, eighth, and ninth generations of Jared, and Methuselah, and Lamech. From which he argues that, because the Hebrew chronology is consistent with its date of the deluge, it was cunningly devised, which is surely no argument at all (p. 281). We shall really not think it necessary or expedient to answer more than a very few objections which have not been answered as we think sufficiently, as they have been resuscitated to notoriety and unreal importance by the reputation and rank of recent writers of modern criticism.

The first that we adduce as coming early in the order of time, is the alleged impossibility of the existence of the extensive empire of Nimrod, in the period assigned by the Jewish Scriptures to its erection. But we see no impediment to joining issue with the framers of this objection on both its points.

We can perceive from the Hebrew Scriptures no extent of the empire under consideration, incompatible with the time which they allow for its coming into existence.

It appears as if the objectors imagine that the Assyrian empire must have attained very considerable magnitude in or about one hundred and twenty years after the deluge. But it may be asked, where is any assertion or insinuation of the kind in the Sacred Volume? That that empire should have thrown out many of its ramifications before the dispersion of mankind, because they are mentioned in the chapter preceding that which relates their dispersion, is a gratuitous assumption. It seems to us to be something more than unreasonable. It appears to be a contradiction to certain statements in the narrative (Gen. x. 10, 11, 20, compared with xi. 1, 2, 8). That Nimrod was mighty, at least comparatively with his contemporaries, is not to

be denied, but there is no evidence that we are aware of, that he did more than lay the foundation of his greatness, at or even later than the supposed objectionable epoch. Indeed, it is expressly written that he *began* to be mighty without fixing the precise date of his extraordinary power. And certainly there is no proof from the Scriptures that even Babylon itself rose in its gigantic proportions at a very early period, unless it must be supposed that we cannot apply to the building of that city the proverbial denial of a sudden erection to the capital of an ancient empire nearer home.

It is very easy to believe that Nimrod achieved real greatness before the termination of his career, and not necessary to imagine that he exhibited that greatness so early as our objectors have supposed. He may have arrived at manhood at no very advanced period of the history, but if we turn to the record which Moses has left us of the generations of Shem, it is extremely credible that the founder of the empire of Assyria lived after the flood two or three or even four hundred years. And Mr. Stuart Poole has said, "It is most reasonable to suppose the Noachian colonists to have begun to spread about three centuries after that event,"<sup>v</sup> a space amply sufficient for a vast increase of population, for the institution of an extensive dominion, and for the high cultivation of the arts, in the descendants of the post-diluvian progenitor of the human race; especially when we consider their early proficiency in manual operations; and these circumstances include, if we mistake not, all the principal facts in their case, which the Scriptures would require us to place within the limits of credibility.

There are only three more objections raised in this division of our subject to which we purpose to extend our attention, and to them principally for this reason, that they have been elevated to some new title to consideration by the opinions of recent essayists and commentators.

The first is the alleged disagreement between 1 Kings vi. 1 and Acts xiii. 20. St. Paul, it is well known, is made by some interpreters to declare that the judges governed the Jews for four hundred and fifty years; a period which is believed to be perfectly inconsistent with 1 Kings vi. 1. We believe that the words of St. Paul are not to be so interpreted. His words, as they are translated in our Bibles, certainly have a very strong appearance to that effect. It appears almost impossible to interpret them otherwise. But it may first be observed that in the original the words are not so clear and unambiguous. It may rather be

---

<sup>v</sup> *Bib. Dict. Chron.*, vol. i., p. 328.



said that St. Paul avoided expressing himself in the sense imputed to him with that unambiguity. In fact, such an unequivocal assertion is one thing exactly which St. Paul did *not* make.

It may be further observed that there exist already, at least, three interpretations of his original words which may not unlikely contain the solution of the difficulty.

It has been asked, by way of objection to an argument used by Calovius, and Mill, and (it may have been intended) by Ussher, whose is one of the three interpretations of which we have a high opinion, "Why" interpret the events which happened in four hundred and fifty years, *if* before the judges, from the "birth of Isaac?" It appears to us not at all an improbable point for the commencement of the Apostle's era. It is surely not unreasonable to intend that the "fathers were chosen" in that patriarch to whom the choice was limited as a branch of the seed of Abraham (Gen. xxi. 12; Gal. iv. 28), and who was at the same time the representative of Him of whom they were the chosen progenitors, and of whose nativity St. Paul was designing, as he spoke, to make a direct statement. We conceive it is more reasonable to regard this interpretation,<sup>a</sup> or either of the two others, as an elucidation of St. Paul's meaning; or to think that modern critics fail in the comprehension of the problem, rather than to conclude St. Paul was ignorant of a period in chronology with which he must in reason be supposed to be familiar; or that St. Luke, himself a learned man, should have been a party to a palpable misrepresentation.

Another pretended error lies in a passage of the speech of St. Stephen (Acts vii.), connected with the chronology of the Hebrew; the fault being imputed to the latter authority. The imputation appears to us to be utterly unfounded. It arises from supposing that Terah was only seventy years of age when Abram was born. Ussher has shewn that he had attained the age of one hundred and thirty years.<sup>a</sup> This correction completely removes the appearance of disagreement between the Old and New Testaments upon the point. It has certainly been objected by a recent writer of distinction, that if it were true that Terah was one hundred and thirty years old when Abram was born to him, it is very unaccountable that Abraham should wonder that he himself should have a child at the age of one hundred (Gen. xvii. 17), "Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old, and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?" Abraham appears to us not to mean by these expressions

---

<sup>a</sup> Uss., *Chron Sac.*, cap. xii.

<sup>a</sup> *Chron. Sac.*, cap. vii.

that it exceeded his belief that a centenarian should increase the number of his family. Such procreation must have been familiar to him, not only in the case of Terah, but in the whole line of his immediate ancestry, and not many years before had actually occurred in his own person. He evidently speaks of himself with reference to his wife, and we think that reason warrants the opinion that he expresses his astonishment that he and Sarah should be blessed with a progeny, after that they had lived together many years, each to a great age, in total infecundity.

And what makes this view of the matter the more presumable is, that the divine answer to Abraham's inquiry refers chiefly, if not solely, to Sarah's powers of generation, as if that were the principal or sole point of Abraham's uncertainty.

Our review of the sceptical objections of modern times might be deemed very incomplete if we pass entirely without remark an observation which appears of late to have caused increased dissatisfaction in enlightened and serious minds. Nothing seems to excite greater doubts, even of the inspiration of Scripture, than that that Word which professes to be inspired by the God of nature should be proved by scientific discovery to be in contradiction to works of the same Almighty power. We need scarcely say that we are alluding to the solemn declaration in Joshua x. 12, 13, of the suspension of the motion of that orb in the heavens which science has proved to be always stationary. Here is a direct contradiction, in the professed Word of God, to a fact which we know of His works. It appears to have brought the inspiration of Scripture, in some degree at least, into grave suspicion. Apologies, we know, have been invented of different kinds. Revelation is not intended to teach science. Writers may reveal divinity without the knowledge of physics. Still the awkward circumstance remains. A declaration is made contrary to fact. And is it possible that such a declaration can have proceeded from the omniscient source of truth?

In answer to this question, we think it reasonable to believe that the declaration has been designedly suffered by God to be written by the instruments of His revelation. We will slightly endeavour to vindicate our opinion. For the reason which has been assigned, it is perfectly certain that the sun never revolves round the earth, and, therefore, cannot be arrested in such a revolution. But for precisely the same reason it is known that the same luminary never rises and never sets. Nevertheless, there are, perhaps, not fewer than a hundred texts in Scripture where it is declared or implied that the sun does move in one or other of those directions. Now we hold it cannot be maintained, with reason, that it is inconsistent with the attributes of the

Deity to allow human expressions to be admitted into the Bible in accommodation to the universal, but erroneous, notion of such common apparent phenomena of nature as the rising and setting of the sun. And yet to avow or direct the cessation of the motion of the sun on Gibeon is not more contrary to fact than either of those expressions. And there is no more reason for thinking that God would not suffer His prophets to say (what they believed) that the sun stood still, than that He would not prevent them to speak of its ascending above the horizon in the morning, and descending below it at the close of day.

And here we terminate our labours. We are ourselves satisfied, and we hope we may have at least contributed to satisfy our readers that no obstacle lies, at least, in the Egyptian history, or in the Hebrew Bible, or in the Septuagint Version (professedly the three most fruitful sources of objection), to believing that the chronology of the authorized translation of the Old Testament is sanctioned by divine authority.

E. C. K.

---

Above all, consider the design and tendency of the New Testament. See to what it will lead you, and all those who cordially obey it; and then say, whether it be not good. And consider how naturally its truth is connected with its goodness. Trace the character and sentiments of its authors, whose living image (if I may be allowed the expression) is still preserved in their writings. And then ask your own heart, Can you think this was a forgery, an impious cruel forgery? For such it must have been, if it were a forgery at all; a scheme to mock God and to ruin men, even the best of men, such as revered conscience, and would abide all extremities for what they apprehended to be truth. Put the question to your own heart, Can I in my conscience believe it to be such an imposture? Can I look up to an omniscient God, and say, "O Lord, thou knowest that it is in reverence to thee, and in love to truth and virtue, that I reject this book, and the method to happiness here laid down."

But there are difficulties in the way. And what then? Have those difficulties never been cleared? Go to the living advocates for Christianity, to those of whose abilities, candour, and piety, you have the best opinion; if your prejudices will give you leave to have a good opinion of any such, tell them your difficulties; hear their solutions; weigh them seriously, as those who know they must answer it to God: and while doubts continue, follow the truth as far as it will lead you, and take heed that you do not "imprison it in unrighteousness" (Rom. i. 18). Nothing appears more inconsistent and absurd, than for a man solemnly to pretend dissatisfaction with the evidences of the gospel, as a reason why he cannot in conscience be a thorough Christian; when yet at the same time he violates the most apparent dictates of reason and conscience, and lives in vices condemned even by the heathens.—*Dr. Doddridge.*

## SELECTIONS FROM THE SYRIAC.—No. II.

THE ENCOMIUM OF THE MARTYRS. BY EUSEBIUS OF CÆSAREA.  
ENGLISH TRANSLATION.<sup>a</sup>

*Encomium of their Excellences.*

1. O YE retainers of Godly freedom and truth in tribulation and in labour; dead in body and free in soul; through the death of the body ye overcame death, armed with faith, and clothed for ever in the robe<sup>b</sup> of faith. For, verily, invincible armour was given to you in faith and in victory;<sup>c</sup> for in your hands abode the shield which is by the law; and the helmets which were on your heads were not weakened nor cast down,<sup>d</sup> and the precepts which are sustaining were not relaxed in you; and sharp, and not blunt, was the spiritual sword; and by earnest prayers through Christ unto the Lord of all, your will ye directed. For unto you was adjudged<sup>e</sup> a heavenly war, and by victory ye became worthy of the heavenly assemblies; for the world which passeth away did not flatter you, nor did it entice you, neither did the wrath of kings make you afraid; and the promise of a gift of the wealth of the world wrested not from your souls the treasure of truth which is for ever; and the pomp of the fashion of the world perverted not your sobriety. For ye hated dishonour and loved distinction, and through the desire of the love<sup>f</sup> of the cross of Christ ye put away from yourselves the curse of crucifixion, which is in malice and in evil. For by affliction for a little time ye acquired immeasurable glory; for in the truth of faith ye served with the prophets, and stood in agreement with

<sup>a</sup> The Syriac text of this discourse, from a MS. written A.D. 411, was printed in our last, pp. 403—408. We were then under the impression that, because the late Canon Cureton had not referred to it in his *Martyrs of Palestine*, to which it is appended in the MS., he had not observed it at all. This was a mistake. We are reminded by Dr. Tregelles that Dr. Cureton alludes to it in the *Festal Letters of Athanasius* (Pref., p. 16); and that it is also mentioned by the late Professor Lee, in his translation of the *Theophany* of Eusebius (Pref., p. xi.).

The following attempt at a translation is generally literal, but the original, like all new documents in the same language, contains words and idioms not explained in grammars and lexicons. This circumstance, and the absence of vowel-points, causes some ambiguity in certain places, but we hope we have succeeded in conveying the general sense. Some of the peculiarities are noticed in the following short annotations.

<sup>b</sup> The word rendered "robe" is the same as that for "furnace," but it occurs in the sense of a vestment of some kind in Ephræm Syrus, as is observed by Dr. Burgess, *Repentance of Nineveh*, note, p. 54.

<sup>c</sup> Or "innocence." The word has both meanings.

<sup>d</sup> The rendering of this clause is uncertain.

<sup>e</sup> Or, "vouchsafed." The word usually means "justified."

<sup>f</sup> Or, "the affectionate desire."

the apostles; and with the glorified blessed, Christ the divine chief, the crown of glory ye received.<sup>g</sup>

2. O ye who are dead in appearance,<sup>h</sup> and alive in reality, for your inferiority to the angels is filled up by the suffering which has happened on behalf of Christ, and through grace victory is vouchsafed to you without much solicitude, and your memory every hour is very full of glory; for ye received in your body the signs of the reproach of Christ, the setting free of your souls; for your death on behalf of Christ assured the hope of your faith; and by the constancy which ye received from above, ye changed the constitution of your former nature, and became the sons and children of desirable wisdom; and by the understanding of knowledge, ye caused your souls to fly to the righteous, and ye ran the race without weariness to the King of truth, and the Lord of the assemblies, which are for ever. Therefore, let labour<sup>i</sup> be ashamed, and the stripped<sup>j</sup> eagerness of the conflicts<sup>k</sup> of men whose labour is not vouchsafed on behalf of Christ; and let them restrain their unprofitable sweat, which is not distilled for the conflict of heaven; and let the race of the eager horses be accounted vain, and their victory be derided, because they cannot be compared to souls upon the horses of Elijah, on which he has in truth arisen.<sup>l</sup> In these the Lord is; for the righteousness of the soul is the chariot of the Lofty One, and a confession wherein is the keeping of his restraints.<sup>m</sup> And let the assemblies of worldly festivals slumber,<sup>n</sup> —those to which a place in heaven is not vouchsafed; for all of them are earnest in body, and an increase of the trade of worldly contests.<sup>o</sup> Let them be ashamed in their labour, which maketh void of the grace of Christ. For those who on behalf of our Lord and our God received in exchange the judgment of their body, are in heaven, in glory, and in victory,<sup>p</sup> and in joy. Hananiah is exalted, and Azariah is lauded, and Mishael the strong one is called glorious. The fire of Babel was kindled, and did not

---

<sup>g</sup> The sections we indicate are the same in the original.

<sup>h</sup> Literally, "in falsehood."

<sup>i</sup> The similar Syriac word, "world," might seem more appropriate here, but is not required, as the orator is about to speak of the toil of competitors in ancient contests.

<sup>j</sup> The Syriac word is the one commonly meaning "Apostolic," but doubtless "stripped" is the idea; perhaps "gymnastic."

<sup>k</sup> Here again the form is that usually rendered "generations" and "courts," but it sometimes means conflicts or contests.

<sup>l</sup> As the sun rises.

<sup>m</sup> "Restraints" seems to be the sense, but the word may be a mistake for "commands." In any case the clause is not quite clear.

<sup>n</sup> Probably "be lost in silence and forgot."

<sup>o</sup> The preceding clause is not clear.

<sup>p</sup> Or, "in purity."

ascend<sup>†</sup> on high, and by the abundance of much wood that was in it, it was deprived of its power, and its destroying nature was shorn of its might, because of the love wherewith it would honour the sons of the law.\* But it was fierce and it was strong, and it burned and destroyed the slanderers who were spectators of the zealous and the blessed. These were confessors, and when the veil of their suffering was before their eyes for reproach and for praise, they drew near to the confessors' fire. The den of hungry mountain-lions also was nullified through fear of the servant of God, of Christ; and the lions were appeased in their hunger, so that they were not defiled by the suffering of the righteous. For Noah fed the beasts with flesh according to the former commandment; but Daniel made them abstinent, that they should fast, as he was able to command in the conflict of righteousness. But let another pit shew the reproach and ignominy of Jewish oppressors,—the one which is a testimony to the earnestness and manliness of Jeremiah. The altar and temple bore witness, and the holy place which was between them, where Zechariah received the crown of victory. And let Abel speak after his death, by denouncing the cruel and hateful in the manners of Cain. But the crown of victory in the great contest both for men and for women, who are in confession (*or become confessors*), the mother of seven sons put on:† she who reared her sons by prayer and by the milk of the law and by heavenly food, stood with every one of them in confession of the utterances of the law, in order that not one of her pains might be deprived of grace, and very much rejoiced because of the fruit which there was upon each one of her branches. For she was not crowned on account of one of her sons, while honour was taken away because of another; nor was it over one that she rejoiced in victory, and was in anguish over another because of his fall; but over all of them, and through all of them, she had great rejoicing, because she saw them all that they stood in the commandment of the law; and she was glad and gave praise, because of the righteousness of her branches in the law; and she offered pure praise and righteous prayer to the Most High the Strengtheners of his servants. How fair was she in duty,‡ and righteous in the law, and blessed in her offspring! A wise mother, thou didst remove indifference far away from thy lovely children, and with-

---

† Or, "was hot, and did not ascend."

\* i. e., Those who were obedient to the law.

† Although most of the illustrations are from our Canonical books, it is plain that Eusebius did not feel himself under any restraint in that direction.

‡ "Duty." We assign this meaning to a word which has the sense of "retribution," "recompence," "suffering," "dissolution," etc.

out blows" they took their stand in the arena: and this is an evidence<sup>a</sup> of true mothers. For it behoves that more than worldly wealth, and than love to our fellow-men, we should love the love of God, and that we should cleave to Christ and love the prophets according to the divine rule, and in everything be like Abraham.<sup>w</sup> O blessed woman, who didst bring forth with hard pains, and without griefs didst restore, by prayer, the fruit thou didst rear; thou, without laments, didst send a messenger for thyself before God. For what time is there, or what day, or what godly congregation of the passion of Christ, and glorious day of the memorial of his resurrection,<sup>e</sup> when the members of the resurrection of the confessor Christ may not be remembered and honoured by every mouth and by every tongue? So, then, let the new soldiers of his faith, equipped with the glory of his truth, pass in remembrance and in word before our eyes, and before the Lord of victory, and the giver of crowns, the Lord Christ, Peter being second in command after our Lord Jesus, in the heavenly host of the glorious ranks, powerful in heaven and also upon earth, closing and opening without envy, in righteousness, the way of the gate of heaven, and not like the Pharisees, the partakers of his blood and of his race.<sup>v</sup> Let us cleave to them, and to every one of the apostles, since it is proclaimed in heaven and by observation that their minister shall receive a crown of righteousness.<sup>f</sup>

3. Let Stephen be crowned; and also Paul, no longer persecuting the churches,<sup>g</sup> declaring his conversion in the Gospel of truth which is from the Deity, which he received and confessed by his suffering for Christ, and he filled up in his body what was behind of the afflictions of Christ for his body, that is, the Church.

4. But also let others be remembered, who, after them, accepted the conflict, and were counted worthy to stand in the true conflict for Christ. Now as worthy of our commemoration, let the men be remembered who, after these, were the

<sup>a</sup> They did not require to be driven by blows into the arena, like cowards.

<sup>w</sup> Or, "a specimen."

<sup>e</sup> We are not sure that the foregoing sentence is correctly rendered throughout; it is certainly obscure and irregular in its construction.

<sup>v</sup> The special allusions here seem to be to Good Friday and Easter Sunday. The phrase rendered "resurrection of the confessor Christ" is ambiguous.

<sup>f</sup> Although this sentence is not very plain, there is no doubt that Peter has ascribed to him all the honour mentioned above.

<sup>g</sup> We are really uncertain as to the precise idea of this place: possibly the "minister" is one who honours the memory of the saints.

<sup>h</sup> Obscure again. Eusebius appears to mean that Paul, instead of persecuting the churches, narrates his conversion in the exercise of that true hope which God gives, and which he has received and avowed.

elect, and who, without reproach and violence, with their souls affirmed the faith,<sup>b</sup>—those who were counted worthy to receive the hope of the apostles. Let there be honoured in our commemoration then, both Asclepiades and Serapion, and Philetus, and Zebinas, and Demetrius, and Flavianus, and Cyrillus (?), and Sosipater, and Andrew, and Babylas, and Cærealis (?), and Izabenus (?), and Zenobius, and Paulus, a kinsman, who was counted worthy to stand in the divine portion, and to be of it. Let Marinus also hasten, and to heaven let Fronto come, and the abstinent old man Hippolytus.<sup>c</sup> Now I know and confess that many others were victorious in this conflict. But although their names escape me, their record, which is in heaven, I remember in my soul, and I lay to heart the sufferings of the Church which is in Christ. For, truly, I hope with all of you, through the divine message, by the truth of the confession<sup>d</sup> which is in Christ, that I shall receive fruit at the resurrection of the dead. I further say to you, O blessed confessors, I desire to depart from the world unto you, and from the body from which you are freed. Now faults fail (those) that (are) with Christ,<sup>e</sup> as ye are this day, and are accounted. May there, at some time, be given the power to say after you, Pains flee, anguish is worn away, and groaning is departed: O ye who exist in the likeness of the suffering of Christ, and die not for ever.

*End of the Discourse upon the Confessors.*

---

<sup>b</sup> Or, with their lives attested the faith.

<sup>c</sup> The eminent saints and martyrs whom Eusebius mentions will not, even in name, be all recognized, owing to the loose way in which their names are spelled in the Syriac. A reference to the *Martyrs of Palestine* supplies the names of Zebinas, and Paulus, but whether they are the same as those in our text does not appear (*Martyrs*, p. 31, 39, 47). Of the rest, we find the names of two or three in other works of Eusebius, and more in the old martyrologies; but we are not about to investigate them here, and will only remark that all the martyrs mentioned in this part of the oration may be such as suffered in Palestine, but are not named in the larger work.

<sup>d</sup> Another ambiguous phrase.

<sup>e</sup> There is a paronomasia in the original here, which is at the same time obscure and abrupt. The whole piece abounds with remarkably crabbed and doubtful expressions, possibly because the translator was not sufficiently master of Greek.



**DR. MAC NEECE'S UNIVERSITY SERMONS.\***

THE name of Thomas Mac Neece, and the prominent position which, for twenty years, he held as Divinity Lecturer in the University of Dublin, are alone a sufficient guarantee for the excellence of these sermons.

To be qualified for the important duty of training candidates for the sacred office of the ministry, it is needful that the teacher should be a man of sound and orthodox views on religion, that he should have a mind analytical and clear, and that earnest piety should mark his inner life.

Such, from a careful perusal of Mac Neece's sermons, we should imagine their lamented author to have been. We see in them traces of a mind characterized by penetration of thought, accuracy of scholarship, and a healthy religious tone.

There is, we believe, with the religious section of the reading public rather a prejudice against University sermons; and we freely admit that if the popular preachers of the present day run too frequently into the one extreme of shallow declamation, university theologians often run into the other, by delivering elaborate essays which, outside academic cloisters, are almost unintelligible.

This, however, is not the character of the present collection of sermons, and none need fear that the learning of their author has, in any degree, mystified their sense. The grand doctrines of the Gospel, which are here so ably set forth, have given to the preacher occasion for much practical exhortation, and for conveying many a useful lesson in things that pertain to life and godliness—lessons which are all the more valuable, as we perceive the solid grounds from which they are deduced. In this we conceive the distinguishing characteristic of a good sermon to consist.

For a preacher to exhort his audience to a certain line of conduct, without pointing out to them the weighty and emphatic reasons which make *their* duty clear, and which leave them deeply accountable, if the advice be disregarded, seems, to say the least, to presuppose that they have implicit faith in the authority of their spiritual guide. To us, this method seems to savour somewhat of presumption, and to be very far removed from the style of apostolic preaching, which, no doubt, all admit

---

\* *Sermons preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, with a Lecture on the Inspiration of the Scriptures.* By the late Thomas Mac Neece, D.D., Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity in the University of Dublin, Rector of Arboe, and Chaplain to His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant. Dublin: Hodges and Smith.

to be our highest model for imitation. From the apostles, indeed, who gave utterance, as inspired messengers, to the oracles of divine truth, we have no right to expect the *grounds* of their exhortation. Their words being stamped with the authority of heaven, contain the positive commands of God, which we are bound to obey without requiring or demanding a reason. In condescension, however, to human weakness, we find that in most cases they were permitted, first, clearly to expound the immutable principles which should regulate human conduct, after which they proceeded to enforce, by exhortation, their practical observance.

Such seems to be the general plan of the perfect exemplar given for our imitation, and it is remarkable that it accords exactly with the soundest positions which the science of rhetoric lays down, while the deviation from this in the style of preaching popular at the present day cannot but be apparent to all who will take the trouble to reflect.

At a time when the foundations of the faith have been so keenly assailed, as in the present age, it is evident that *instruction* from the pulpit is a matter of very great importance. It has accordingly of late engaged a large share of public attention. And in the strife of parties, when high church, low church, and broad church views are equally struggling for ascendancy, we can hardly expect to find even comparative unanimity of opinion among their different exponents. It is but natural that the discourses of each party should follow the type of their school. Yet, although the peculiar tenets of each class may differ, it is not unreasonable that all thoughtful minds should expect in the pulpit the same intellectual soundness which is indispensably required in the senate and at the bar.

In order that a sermon should be really useful, it may be conceded that *instruction* should assume a very prominent place in its composition. The preacher, no doubt, has only the same original materials to work upon that his audience already possess, and have often already made use of. He may, however, by accurate scholarship, and philosophic study of the Sacred Word, draw out from the mine many a hidden treasure of truth, which, though often stumbled on by the casual passer-by, has hitherto lain unappropriated. And, again, as the ablest writers are the most suggestive, the preacher may, by a judicious treatment of his subject, start many a happy train of thought in the mind, which, when followed up, may leave a very lasting impression, and be attended with the most beneficial results.

In any case in which the writer or the public speaker wishes to produce a permanent effect, by convincing the mind as well

as persuading the affections, the natural course for him to adopt, in order that he may *carry his point*, whatever that may be, is a calm and lucid statement of the subject, developing the various lines of argument, gradually bringing accumulated weight to bear upon the point, and thus preparing the *feelings* for acquiescence in the judgment of the *mind*. After some such course as this has been adopted in the outset, then exhortation, or any other rhetorical means of influencing the feelings, comes most suitably, and with incredibly more force than if the mind were left unconvinced. The author who would thus endeavour, first, to prove his point, and then to work upon the emotional impulses within, is, to use the excellent illustration of a late well-known writer,<sup>b</sup> in the position of a swordsman wielding a sabre whose back is heavy and whose edge is keen. The weight of the back gives force to the blow, and the sharpness of the edge ensures the depth and severity of the wound. So universally are the common sense and intrinsic merit of this method of composition acknowledged, that all the best orators and writers of antiquity and of modern times seem to have instinctively adopted it.

Now, in a case in which the majesty of Divine Truth is concerned, and in which its acceptance depends so much upon the proper handling of the subject, we should conceive that one of the most important studies of the preacher ought to be the most suitable method of conveying truth, in order that its reception may be ensured; and yet, strange to say, we hear but occasionally from the pulpit a sermon thus really well constructed.

There is to be found in the *Table Talk* of old John Selden (1663) a maxim with regard to pulpit composition, which we should almost recommend some enterprising stationer to have lithographed at the head of all sermon paper. It runs thus:—"First in your sermons use your logic, and then your rhetoric; rhetoric without logic is like a tree with leaves and blossoms, but no root." Our readers will, of course, observe the rather incorrect employment of terms in this passage, as if "logic" and "rhetoric" were mutually inconsistent, and as if rhetoric did not deal with conviction as well as with persuasion. Still, however, it is easy to understand his meaning, and our readers will readily perceive that by the term "logic," he implies the argumentative part of the discourse, and by "rhetoric," the impassioned appeal to the feelings.

Now, how often do we meet, among the popular preachers of the present day, with examples of the "tree with leaves and blossoms, but no root?" In large cities we may always observe,

---

<sup>b</sup> Archbishop Whately.

if we may so speak, a *determination* towards certain favourite churches and preachers. Public taste, for the most part, takes a run in some particular direction ; and there are always to be found preachers who exactly suit the tendency of the place. Whether this is to be accounted for by fashion, by the principle of reflex sympathy, by the preacher's perhaps involuntary accommodation of style to the known feelings of the congregation, or by the shallow and sensation taste of the present day, is a point we shall not presume to decide. Certain it is that many a sermon, which, if delivered before a select and thoughtful audience, would infallibly be condemned, is highly admired when heard from the pulpits of our fashionable city churches. In an intellectual age like the present, and especially when a spirit of free-thinking with regard to religion is abroad, we question very much whether a style of discourse, generally remarkable for its absence of thought and its abundance of vapid declamation, is likely to prove the most salutary and useful. We rarely hear from our city pulpits a sermon such as the congregation of Quebec Chapel must have often listened to with delight during the ministry of Dean Alford or of Dean Magee—a sermon which educated and uneducated would alike confess to be a masterly composition. We seldom hear a sermon in which the intellectual acuteness of a cultivated mind is brought to bear upon the sublimity of eternal truth, and in which classic elegance adorns the utterance of Christian piety and devotion. It is true that men possessed of such powers are but of very rare occurrence, yet we find as large, or larger audiences, and of the same respectable character, crowding to hear some popular preacher, whom a comparison with such men would altogether extinguish.

No doubt the confidence inspired by the sight of a multitude of human eyes all directed towards the preacher, and the thought that a thousand ears are drinking in each word that falls from his lips in the solemn stillness of the sacred edifice, goes far to account for their success. The sense, moreover, of ministerial responsibility increased in proportion to the number of souls in charge, and also, perhaps (such is the vanity of human nature), the symptoms of personal idolization which are too often shewn, stimulate the popular preacher to fresh exertions.

If, however, the rapid delivery of the popular pulpit orator would allow his sermon to be closely analysed, we should see how badly it would stand the test. And, occasionally, when a much admired discourse is published by request, those who read it afterwards can hardly bring themselves to believe it to be the same which yielded so much pleasure in its delivery, while those whose first acquaintance is made with it through the medium of

print, wonder how any one could have solicited the publication of such a flat and empty composition. The long periods which seem so striking, when aided by the artificial adjuncts of a theatrical manner, and a sonorous delivery, sink into insignificance when quietly reviewed by the fire-side in sober black and white. In fact, the sensation taste of the present day expects from the preacher but little thoughtfulness or reasoning power, and sometimes we even see a large congregation drawn together by the eccentricity of the preacher's manner, or (*credat Judæus*) by his very coarseness of expression. The style of these modern theologians is not usually characterized by the tediousness of Barrow, and of many of the Puritan divines. They seldom fall into this error, which Dr. Johnson considered to be the unpardonable sin in any author. If they had this fault, they would not be listened to at all. It is in poverty of reasoning, unskilful handling of the subject, and want of sufficient grounds to justify the strong appeal to the passions, that their fault consists. In fact, we sometimes find them falling into the grievous rhetorical error of *avowed exhortation*—actually telling the audience *to be prepared*, to feel such and such sentiments, bespeaking to order the impressions and resolves which should be the just and legitimate offspring of a skilful appeal to all the faculties of our intellectual and moral and emotional nature.

In *energy*, at least of manner, we seldom find a deficiency in these preachers. In *simile*, they are usually abundant; though, perhaps, it may require a mind of some acuteness, in most cases, to detect the pertinence of the illustration. Their powers of *persuasion* are best attested by the extravagant meed of praise with which they are rewarded by the unthinking, and of *conviction* by the evanescent impress they leave upon the mind of their admirers.

By these remarks, we do not by any means wish to insinuate that we consider them at all devoid of good intentions. Far from it. On the contrary, we believe that in most cases their intentions are excellent, and their personal piety beyond question. We do, however, question very much if the style of spiritual food thus afforded is suitable to the requirements of the present age. We by no means advocate for a mixed, or, indeed, for any congregation, a deep and learned sermon, full of metaphysical subtleties and critical dissertations; but we do think that, for an educated city audience, composed for the most part of the upper classes—gentlemen who have received a university education, and ladies, who, perhaps, have made some progress in reading Dante and Schiller in the original—it is not desirable,

and is far from edifying, to produce a sermon devoid of anything that can engage or occupy the understanding, and which addresses itself entirely to the passions, to the utter neglect of the intellectual faculties of the listeners.

With a congregation of the poor and uneducated, no doubt the case is somewhat different ; for them, as indeed for all others, the simplest form of expounding the truth is the most effective. Nevertheless, we believe it to be the province of the highest intellect, on the part of the preacher, to bring down the loftiest truths to the comprehension of even the least reasoning minds, and to make the sublimest mysteries of the Gospel minister to the spiritual wants of the poor and the unlettered. Notwithstanding the partiality which some classes in the religious world shew for the reading of printed sermons, it seems generally admitted that it is a branch of literature by no means in esteem with the public. Much of this distaste, we feel convinced, is produced by the vast libraries of sermons which daily issue from the press, with no intrinsic merits to recommend them ; while those of real worth, to act as a counterpoise, are comparatively few.

The perusal, therefore, of a volume such as Mac Neece's Sermons, is, indeed, a pleasure such as we but rarely have. In them we find what we have faintly tried to portray in the preceding pages, namely, our idea of what a good sermon ought to be. His are sermons whose purpose was not accomplished when the last echo of the preacher's voice was heard ; their thoughts were, no doubt, treasured up in mind by many of those who heard them uttered, and their fruit will only be appreciable in another life : and now that they are given to the public at large, they will, we trust, convey comfort to the afflicted, hope to the desponding, and instruction to all who read them.

To select from the volume before us many remarkable passages, as specimens of their style,—passages full of thought, of eloquence, and of piety—would be a comparatively easy task, were it not for the *embarras de richesse* that everywhere meets us. After the foregoing observations, however, we feel that it would be unsatisfactory to most of our readers merely to lay before them isolated passages, although in themselves remarkable, without pointing out our author's observance of those fundamental principles which, in the preceding pages, we have attempted to enunciate. It is our purpose, therefore, to present the reader with a sketch or outline of one or two of the sermons, in order to shew their structure, and the consistency of thought which prevails throughout, and then by a few scattered passages to exhibit the tone of the writer's mind.

The first two sermons in the collection treat of "Faith considered as an Operative Principle," and are founded on the text, Gal. v. 6: "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith, which worketh by love." Proceeding on sound logical principles, Dr. Mac Neece first explains to us the scriptural notion of faith itself, in order to guard against any subsequent confusion in the mind, owing to an erroneous or incomplete conception of its nature. He accordingly discriminates between faith as it is in its relation to *truths*, and faith as it is in its relation to *persons*. Faith in a truth seems simply to express belief, *i. e.*, our mental acquiescence in the proposition presented to us, and our conviction of it as fact. But faith being represented in Scripture as an operative principle, working by love, it is not easy to see how mere intellectual belief can put forth a working energy without taking into consideration the nature of the truths which are received.

If the truths be merely of a speculative nature, and devoid of personal interest to the individual, not gratifying his feelings, tastes, or passions, they are not likely to exert any influence on his life. "But whenever," says Dr. Mac Neece, "the things believed are fitted to awake any emotion or other active principle of our nature, belief becomes a power. Such it is in all matters respecting man's life, his interests, and his passions. Let a geologist tell a man there is a coal mine on his property; if he believe him, be assured his faith will not be long inoperative."

To constitute, however, that faith which enables us thoroughly to accept and make use of the truths of religion, more than mere intellectual assent is needful. *Sympathy* with the truth is a necessary element.

"The *mind* must assent to it as *true*; the *will* must *consent* to it as good; so that faith will thus be equivalent to *belief of the truth and a cordial reception of it*. There cannot be religious faith until the moral nature has been brought into harmony in a greater or less degree with the truths believed; and this can only be effected by the softening and renewing influence of God's spirit. Then, and not till then, will true faith arise in the soul, and that same moral element which, and which alone, converts it into an active power, will also stamp it as a Christian virtue."

It would, nevertheless, be but an imperfect notion of faith to consider that it implies merely our mental acquiescence in *truths*, however important they may be. The faith which the inspired writers of the New Testament speak of is faith in a *person*, namely, Christ Himself. The reason of this, says Dr. Mac Neece, is obvious:—

"All the great truths of the Gospel relate to Christ or converge

towards Him, and rest on Him as their living centre. To believe in these truths, therefore, without believing in Christ, is a contradiction in terms. But how does faith in Christ differ from faith in a truth? It differs by including the idea of *trust*."

He then compares the trust which the Christian, alive to a sense of his danger, places in his Saviour, to the confidence which the patient feels in the skill and good-will of his physician; and then, in an eloquent passage, which we subjoin, describes by contrast the efficacy of faith, and the pure happiness which it confers.

"If we believe in Him with all our heart, and confidently rely on Him as standing in this relation towards us, then we have genuine Gospel faith, the faith which worketh by love, the victorious principle which overcometh the world. Oh, my brethren, how wretched, how pitiable, is the state of a person who has no faith! To him the world of spirits—with all the lofty hopes, the high aspirations, the bright visions, the pure enjoyments connected with it—is a dream, a blank. He is of the earth, earthy; his thoughts, his affections, his engagements, are all of the earth. He has no faith in human truth or goodness, or honour and honesty; and he will soon lose whatever of these qualities remains to himself, for man is sure to become in the end the thing he believes. No man ever yet did great things who had not faith: faith in something. Napoleon, if he had not faith in God, had faith in his destiny and his genius."

The second sermon is a continuation of the same subject, and is equally valuable, as well from the importance of the topic as from the ability which it displays. The soundness of Dr. Mac Neece's scholarship, and his remarkably accurate acquaintance with the New Testament in the original Greek, entitle his observations on the deep and interesting question that he discusses to the thoughtful consideration of every theologian.

Having, in the former sermon, analysed the notion of faith as given in Holy Scripture, it seems to be his object, in this discourse, to point out its power as an operative principle, by shewing *how* it works, namely, by *love*—"love to God overflowing into love for His children." The discussion of this branch of the subject especially brings our author into collision with Bishop Bull, who, through an incorrect translation of the text (as proved in note *a*), denies the active power of faith, understanding that idea, as used in St. Paul's epistles, to denote "the totality of the Christian virtues, or, in other words, a life of obedience to God." Though endowed with those keen reasoning powers which have made the author of the *Defensio Fidei Nicæni* illustrious, yet Bishop Bull does not seem to have possessed such critical accuracy of scholarship as would entitle him



authoritatively to fix the interpretation of doubtful words or passages in the New Testament.

In this instance, in particular, he seems to have been grievously led into error, by translating the latter clause of the text in a passive form, thus "faith *perfected* (*ἐνεργουμένη*) by love," a version which, if correct, would completely overthrow that sound notion of faith which our author has so ably defined. From a careful induction, however, of all the passages in which the verb *ἐνεργῶμαι* occurs, Dr. Mac Neece has, in an able note upon the subject, arrived at the conclusion that the New Testament writers have used the word in this as in other passages in the middle form, but with an active signification, thus establishing the correctness of our Authorized Version of the text. He likewise shews, in the course of the sermon, that Bishop Bull's idea of faith, as synonymous with obedience, is one totally inadmissible, being quite devoid of Scripture warrant.

Considering love as the noblest of all the religious affections, and therefore their representative, Dr. Mac Neece, in a very philosophic way, conducts the reader to the general principle, "that the mode in which religious faith influences men's conduct and character is by awakening and directing those religious feelings and affections which are the prime movers in the inner life of the soul."

Having premised that faith preceding love gives to it its peculiar religious character, the preacher then explains how, in the Almighty Ruler of the Universe, whose very nature is *love*, are combined all the conditions which should call forth from His creatures the warmest emotions of that passion. Next, adverting briefly, and with sorrow, to the gloomy creed of the sceptic, the preacher eloquently contrasts the comparative cheerfulness and consoling nature of that knowledge of God which is derived from revealed religion with the meagre and perplexing results of natural religion.

"Let us not," says he, "delay longer in the dismal blank of atheism, which not a single ray of truth or goodness illumines. Let us pass on to the theism of natural religion. It is refreshing to escape from the darkness of the nethermost pit to the twilight lustre of this upper world. But the light, though pure, is cold. We have, indeed, here a personal and living God, whose moral excellencies command our devout admiration, and whose goodness, which is over all His works, speaks to our hearts. But the God of natural religion is still afar off. He is the Infinite Spirit, the Absolute, the Self-existent, far withdrawn into the depths of His own unfathomable being. 'Tis true that He manifests Himself to us in His works. And when, on some calm and lovely day, we look on the fair face of nature, and behold the rich provision made for the gratification of every

sense, and see every creature full of exuberant and happy life, we are prompted to lift up our hearts in love and thankfulness to the gracious Being who has so lavishly showered His bounties on His creatures, and made the earth so lovely as an habitation for them to dwell in. But, alas! the scene soon changes. Sunshine is succeeded by clouds and darkness; the gentle zephyr gives place to the violent and destructive hurricane; the roaring of the thunder, and the flash of the terrible lightning, startle the lately calm and serene face of nature; or, what is still more awful and mysterious, even while all things look secure and peaceful, the inhabitants of the earth are visited by 'the pestilence that walketh in darkness, and the destruction that wasteth at noon-day.' Yes, brethren, in the midst of life we are in death, nor is there a single spot of our globe of which we can say with our great moral poet that it is

'By sad mortality's earth-sullyng wing  
Unswept, unstained.'

These things pain and perplex the mere natural reason; clouds and darkness gather round the throne of the Almighty; faith falters,—perchance fails; and the heart has no firm resting-place. But it is not so with the Christian. He is sure of his Father's love, and knows that 'all things work together for good to them that love God;' that his trials and troubles are sent in mercy to correct his faults, to try, and by trying, to strengthen his faith—to wean him from this world; in a word, to educate him for eternity."

This admirable sermon concludes by pointing out the important truth that faith and love, the inner springs of our spiritual life, can themselves only come from Him by whose spirit the new creation in the soul is wrought. Tracing the entire sustenance of the soul in health to the watchful care of the Almighty, our author thus beautifully compares it to the process by which the nourishment of vegetable life is provided.

"We may compare the infusion of spiritual life into the soul by God to His impartation of vegetable life to a tree; faith and love, considered as the organs of the inner life, we may compare to the roots of the tree which cleave to the soil for nourishment and support, and to the sap which is propelled through the trunk to every branch and fibre; and, finally, we may compare good works, which are the products and manifestations of the vital energies, to the leaves and blossoms with which the tree is adorned, and to its fruits, which are pleasant to the eye and grateful to the palate. No one of these is to be overlooked, nor are they to be confounded one with another."

In the fifth of these discourses, which treats of our Lord's sermon on the Mount, the preacher chooses as his text, St. Matt. v. 48: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father, which is in heaven, is perfect." There is hardly any sermon in the volume that we can more confidently recommend our readers to study for themselves than this; and an illustration from so able

a pen of the chief discourse of Him who spake as never man spake, cannot fail to be read with profit. A brief outline of the sermon will, doubtless, be acceptable. After some preliminary remarks, the writer notices two opposite and unsound theories which have been advanced as to our Lord's object in the delivery of this discourse. The one limits the sermon to an exposition of pure evangelic morality; the other too widely extends its sphere, by considering that it contains "the sum and substance of Christianity, the very chief matter of the Gospel of our Redeemer." A sufficient answer to this latter view, which is held by the late Rev. F. W. Robertson,\* may be found in the fact, that the essential Christian doctrines of the Incarnation of our Lord, his Atonement, and the Trinity in Unity, are nowhere explicitly enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount; and if we subtract these all-important doctrines from "the sum and substance of Christianity," the remainder would indeed be meagre. Independently of this fact, which alone proves the unsoundness of the above theory, we have likewise the fact that this view tacitly ignores the existence of the additional truths revealed in the inspired letters of our Lord's apostles, or even, as its author does, disparages the idea that they should be believed more fully to unfold the Christian system than He did Himself. If the apostles wrote as uninspired men, we should in that case, says Dr. Mac Neece, seek in our Lord's own words the fullest exposition of his truth: but when his Spirit spake by them, is it not natural that He should reserve for them the task of giving a more complete disclosure of the mysteries of Christianity than could have been revealed before the occurrence of the events of his lifetime which formed its historical basis?

In this we but see an example of the progressive development of revelation to suit the advancing state of the world, when men could more cordially receive the faith; and an illustration of God's usual method of communicating his truth to man, gradually increasing the brilliancy of the light till it shines even to the perfect day.

By a careful comparison of passages from the Sermon on the Mount, Dr. Mac Neece next vindicates it from the imputation of being simply a Christian ethical discourse, unfolding and amplifying the moral precepts of the Mosaic Law. He thus most clearly shews that the existence of Christ's kingdom, and man's allegiance to Him as the Messiah, are principles which entirely pervade this, the fullest record of our Saviour's teaching, which the Evangelists have supplied us with.

---

\* Sermons: Third Series. London, 1862. p. 164.

Passing on to the polemical part of the discourse, in which our Lord supersedes or adds a moral enforcement to the precepts of olden time, the question arises as to what it is which our Lord has, in so marked a manner, contrasted with the pure and holy principles which He has propounded. Does the opposition lie between the Law of Moses and the Gospel system, or between the Gospel and the vast body of traditionary ordinances and precepts which the Jews considered as of equal authority with the Law, or, again, between the Gospel and the Law corrupted and added to by the tradition of men?

For many reasons, which will, no doubt, meet the approbation of the candid reader, Dr. Mac Neece adopts the last of the three views just mentioned. In order to explain how Christ's teaching could have been in opposition to the Law, the writer examines at some length the nature of the Mosaic ritual, and shews that in its juridical element it was merely intended to serve a temporary purpose, being designed for the government of a peculiar people; but Christ having come not to destroy, but to fulfil the Law, while He abrogated its merely ceremonial ordinances, unfolded to the world its deep and spiritual meaning. During the early ages of Jewish history, the chief object of the Lawgiver seems to have been the isolation of the chosen race from the idolatrous nations of Palestine. The enactments, however, which forbid this intercourse, could hardly, in reason, remain in force when the temporary danger had passed away, and the fulness of time had come when all the nations of earth, being of one blood, were about to be received within the one fold of the Gospel church.

We subjoin the passage in which the writer shews that the exclusive character of the Old Dispensation must, of necessity, give place to the liberal and comprehensive character of the New:—

“An intense and repulsive nationalism of this kind could not be the principle of that religion, which acknowledges no national distinctions as affecting the spiritual status of its members, but draws all men to its bosom by the bonds of a common human brotherhood, and afterwards binds them together by a closer and more tender tie, even by that brotherly love which they must feel as members of Christ and children of the same heavenly Father. The spirit of that religion is a spirit of self-sacrificing love which beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.”

At the close of the sermon we have an earnest exhortation to strive towards the attainment of that heavenly perfection set before us, which is the transcript of God's spotless character. “True” (says the preacher), the picture is but an ideal one of what men ought to be, yet it is the only one which a Being of

perfect holiness could give. And though incapable of full realization in this present life, still by it the Christian is ever animated to fresh exertion through the spiritual strength imparted from on high.

In Sermon xxi. on "The duty of declaring all the counsel of God," we have some most valuable advice which a moment's reflection must convince our readers is greatly required at the present day. The preacher, addressing himself especially to those of his audience who had selected as their future profession the ministry of the Gospel, emphatically cautions them against the danger of entertaining partial and exclusive views on religious subjects. There is no doubt but that many of the popular preachers alluded to in the foregoing part of this article have attained their popularity by giving prominence in their discourses to certain favourite subjects (generally, indeed, those which are least understood by man), and by expounding one-sided views and special *phases* of the truth to the comparative exclusion of others equally important, not imitating in this respect the conduct of St. Paul to the Ephesian Church, who "did not shun to declare to them *all* the counsel of God" (*πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ*). The remarks of our author on this subject are well worthy of attention, not only from their real value, but because they evidence great breadth of view and habits of close observation:—

"There are few who have not their favourite doctrines. These are favourites with them for several reasons. Either because they are most accordant with their peculiar temperament and habit of mind; or because they have been recommended to them by the authority of persons whom they admire or revere; or because they have been objected to by some sect or party with whom they have no sympathy, and have accordingly been more zealously adhered to, more fondly cherished and more exclusively dwelt on in consequence of this very opposition. From motives such as these we find many, both clergy and laity, adopting a certain set of favourite doctrines to the practical, if not avowed neglect of others equally spiritual and, perhaps, equally important. As instances of what I mean, I may point to the fact that some persons dwell chiefly on the divine decrees; others on the reality of human responsibility and the necessity of human effort; some on the doctrine of justification by faith only; others on the duty of good works and of continual progress in holiness; some on the relations whereby man is directly linked as an individual with God; others on those which connect him with the church, and on the duties to God and to the brethren springing out of those relations; some on the grace derived from the saving truths of the Gospel, when mixed with faith in those that hear them; others on the grace derived from those same truths, when embodied in the Sacraments and other external ordinances of the Church; some, in fine, dwell almost exclusively on the first coming of Christ and His invisible in His Church, and that

spiritual kingdom of God which is within us; while others specially devote themselves to speculations of His second coming, and on the nature of the kingdom which He will then establish."

The following passage from Sermon xvi. speaks of the perfect knowledge the believer shall hereafter attain to, when being made like his Saviour from seeing Him as He is, all erroneous notions as to God's character, and all the clouds that dim our mortal sight, shall be removed.

"But in the great day of manifestation these errors shall vanish away like morning clouds before the rising sun, and every other cause of imperfection shall disappear with them. 'Gazing with unveiled face on the glory of God,' His people shall be 'transformed into the same image from glory to glory.' And thus at all times the more complete the knowledge of God, and the more intimate the acquaintance with Him, which His creatures are enabled to enjoy, the more God-like they become. And, on the other hand, just in the same proportion as they become morally like unto God, they are qualified to make still greater advances in the knowledge of His perfections, and this process of mutual interaction in the departments of knowledge and love, of wisdom, and holiness, will go on through eternity. What a wondrous prospect for the Christian! How infinitely does it transcend all that ever before entered into the heart of the wisest of the human race to conceive of man's nature and destiny."

From the copious extracts already given the reader may form some opinion as to the general merit of the book. The theological student will find in it a complete body of divinity, the offspring of a profound and pious mind, while the less thoughtful, but equally earnest Christian, may derive from it ample supplies of spiritual consolation and refreshment.

From these sermons we can see the broad and comprehensive views their author was accustomed to take of any subject that he dealt with. They are marked neither by trivial special pleading nor frothy ornamentation, but evidence throughout a vigorous manliness of thought and felicitous perspicuity of language, while those points which are of real importance to the subject are selected and set forth with singular force and clearness. We are impressed, on their perusal, with the conviction that their author must have been a man of a deeply pious and reverent spirit, a strong sense of duty, high scholarship, and an intimate acquaintance with the sacred writings. His quotations from Scripture are frequent, but never, as we find with many writers, unmeaning—always philosophic and to the point.

Perhaps the best illustrations of this remark are to be found in the lecture on the Inspiration of Scriptures, in which a subject confessedly difficult is handled with remarkable clearness and ability, and Holy Scripture itself so aptly quoted as to become

the proof and evidence of its own inspiration. We should strongly recommend the perusal of this treatise to all who wish for a brief and comprehensive statement of the question.

The interesting and elegantly written memoir which is prefixed to the volume, from the pen of his colleague in the Divinity School, is an able and affectionate tribute of respect for departed worth. We quite agree with its author in regretting that all the discourses are not accompanied by a body of critical annotations, such as are appended to the first two, published some years ago.

There yet remain one or two considerations which induce us to recommend these sermons to the public. From the spirit of infidelity that is abroad, especially in England, thoughtful minds are apt to be unsettled in vital questions of religion. And if an affected philosophy is disposed to question the defences of the Faith, we have here a powerful and scientific intellect, expounding from an orthodox point of view the saving efficacy of the truth which Holy Scripture has revealed.

One more reason induces us to recommend this volume to the attention of our English readers. The late sessions of Parliament have drawn out from various sources strong expressions of antipathy to the Church establishment. And as, when the strain comes, the cable must always give way at its weakest link, so the Irish branch of the Established Church is sure to be the first assailed, in consequence of the smaller numerical proportion which its members bear to those of other denominations, as compared with England. If it then should fall, it would require no extraordinary foresight to predict the fate of the English branch.

Under these circumstances it is felt that the Church's chief safeguard under providence consists in the orthodoxy, the faithfulness, and the high standing of her ministers. In Mac Neece's sermons, then, the English public, who are looking anxiously to the state of the sister Church beyond St. George's Channel, will find not only the production of an Irish clergyman eminent for his talents and his piety, but they may form some estimate of the education of the Irish clergy at large from the discourses of a great and good man, who for so long a period greatly contributed to guide and mould the sentiments of the Divinity Students in the Dublin University, and whose influence has doubtless been largely felt thereby throughout the ranks of the junior clergy. It is to be hoped that the record now presented of his past teaching may help them onward in the noble but arduous task which lies before them, of "feeding the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood."

W. S. D.

---

## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

*[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]*

---

## THE ARCHONS OF DEMOSTHENES.

THE great importance of chronology, as a testimony that Jesus Christ was the Messiah foretold by Daniel, and the seeming impossibility of shewing by the common chronology that He was so, must be my apology for again trespassing on your columns in defence of my position as to the archons of Demosthenes.

If there really were more archons eponymi in the time of Philip than are given in the list of Diodorus, it follows, of necessity, that all the archons which preceded those additional ones must have been placed by Diodorus too low, and, consequently, in wrong Olympic years.

Under these circumstances, it is our duty carefully and dispassionately to consider what may be advanced both for and against the additional archons of Demosthenes.

In your number for January last, p. 428, Dr. Hincks says, "All the archons mentioned by Demosthenes were Thesmothetæ." In your number for April, I endeavoured to shew from the language of Demosthenes that at least Mnesithides, who was mentioned by him as an archon, was not one of the six Thesmothetæ, but an eponymus archon. In your number for July Dr. Hincks says, "Mr. Parker has begged the question as to Mnesithides having been an *Athenian* archon. It is evident to me that he was archon at Delphi." This would seem to be something like an admission that I had succeeded in shewing that Mnesithides was, at least, an eponymus archon. But I am not quite sure that this is Dr. Hincks' meaning: for, immediately before, he says, "The other statement of mine against which Mr. Parker contends is, that the archons mentioned by Demosthenes as having had decrees, passed when they were in office, were Thesmothetæ. I need only re-affirm this, which is, I believe, the opinion of all who have treated on the subject, with the single exception of Mr. Parker, and against which he has not adduced a single argument of any weight. All he can say is that, in addition to the eight archons mentioned by Demosthenes as presiding at the passing of decrees, he mentions a ninth as giving a date. This ninth Mnesithides must, he says, have been an archon eponymus, and consequently the other eight must have been eponymi too. The conclusion does not follow. But, I will add, Mr. Parker has begged the question as to Mnesithides having been an *Athenian* archon. It



is evident to me that he was archon at Delphi. The decree of the Amphictyons is first given, at the passing of which Cleinagoras presided as priest. His name appears in the preamble, just as the name of the Thesmothetæ appears in the preamble of an Athenian decree. But at the end of the decree, or at the back of it, the date would be given. At Athens the archon eponymus of the year would be named, and at Delphi the person who was archon eponymus *there*. This appears to me the most natural solution of the difficulty; but it is not the only one."

Thus, in one line we have Dr. Hincks re-affirming his opinion that Mnesithides was one of the Thesmothetæ; then, a few lines after, it is evident to the doctor that he was an archon at Delphi; and, a few lines after, his opinion comes out that he was an archon eponymus at Delphi. I presume that this is what the doctor means; but he can scarcely expect your readers to believe that Mnesithides was both one of the Thesmothetæ at Athens, and also an archon eponymus at Delphi. At all events, I need not, after this, add to the weight of my argument to prove that he was not one of the six Thesmothetæ, but an archon eponymus.

In my last paper I certainly begged the question as to Mnesithides being an *Athenian* archon. The decree, which was produced and read by the officer of the court, at the instance of Demosthenes, was a decree of the Amphictyons, and the pontificate of Cleinagoras was given in it, as the Amphictyonic date; but this not being sufficiently explicit, Demosthenes presses for the date; and surely it is not unreasonable to assume that the date given under these circumstances by an officer of the court in an *Athenian* Court, was an *Athenian* date, that is to say, that the name of the archon eponymus, which was given as the date, was the name of an *Athenian* archon eponymus, and it is for Dr. Hincks to prove, and not merely suggest, that he was archon eponymus at Delphi. It would also be well if the doctor could produce any other instance of there having been an archon eponymus at Delphi who gave the name to the year. If in an English court of justice an officer of the court gave the date of a document which he had produced at the instance of a suitor, as the first of Victoria, would it be thought unreasonable if I assumed that he meant Victoria, Queen of England?

Having proved that Mnesithides was an archon eponymus, I assumed that the other eight archons of Demosthenes were also archons eponymi. Nor was it necessary to enter into any argument as to these other eight archons, which are mentioned by Demosthenes, and not found in the list of Diodorus. For the finding of only one additional archon eponymus of the time of Philip would be good evidence that there must have been at least one year more between the Peloponnesian war and the death of Alexander than are given by Diodorus. Of course, I am assuming that all the archons given by Diodorus were eponymi. But I can say something as to these other eight archons also. In Demosthenes (*Pro Ctesiphonte, de Coronâ*, p. 253) we read, "The Decree. In the archonship of

Chærondas, son of Hegemon, on the twenty-fifth day of the month Gamelion, the Leontidian tribe then presiding, at the motion of Aristonicus, the following decree was made," . . . . "that he (Demosthenes) shall be crowned with a golden crown," etc. In p. 282 of the same *Oration* we find, "A Decree. In the archonship of Heropythus, on the twenty-fifth day of the month Elaphebolion, the Erecthian tribe presiding, the senate and generals came to the following resolution," etc. "*Another Decree.* In the archonship of Heropythus, the last day of the month Munichion, at the motion of the Polemarch: Whereas Philip is exerting his most strenuous efforts to alienate the Thebans from us," etc.

Here, then, we have decrees, given by Demosthenes, as in the archonships of Chærondas and Heropythus, with their preambles similarly expressed; and if it can be proved that Chærondas was an archon eponymus at Athens, the plain inference must be that Heropythus was also an archon eponymus at Athens.

I presume Dr. Hincks will scarcely suggest that either of these was an archon eponymus at Delphi. Æschines, in his *Oration against Ctesiphon*, to prove that Ctesiphon had presumed to confer the honour of a crown on Demosthenes, when engaged in every kind of public magistracy, says, "These things I shall prove by the testimony of Demosthenes and Ctesiphon themselves. For, in the archonship of Chærondas, on the twenty-second of the month Thargelion, was a popular assembly held, in which Demosthenes obtained a decree, appointing a convention of the tribes on the second of the succeeding month," etc.

Plutarch (*Demosthenes*, i., 857) says, "The accusation against Ctesiphon, *Concerning the Crown*, was written and brought on in the archonship of Chærondas, a little before the battle of Chæronea, but was decided ten years afterwards in the archonship of Aristophon." Plutarch was a native of Chæronea. We also find Chærondas in the list of Diodorus's archons, and from his *lib.* xvi. 84—88, we learn that the battle of Chæronea was fought in the archonship of Chærondas at Athens. Thus Chærondas was clearly an eponymus archon of Athens, and the inference is plain that Heropythus must also have been an *Athenian* archon eponymus. The same kind of argument might be pursued as to the other seven archons which are mentioned by Demosthenes, and not found in the list of Diodorus. In other parts of Demosthenes we find the following also mentioned as archons:—Euclides, p. 742; Evander, p. 743; Polyzelus, Cephisodorus, Chion, Timocrates, p. 868; Dysnicetus, Nicophemus, p. 1132; Agathocles, p. 1152; Socratidas, p. 1186; Alcisthenes, p. 1193; Lyciscus, p. 1330; Asteias, Phrasielides, p. 1357. These are also found in the list of Diodorus, and will, therefore, we presume, be readily admitted to be archons eponymi of Athens. But what will become of the statement of Dr. Hincks:—"All the archons mentioned by Demosthenes were *Thesmothetæ*?" I will allow him to mean only all those that are mentioned by Demosthenes and not found in Diodorus; but there is clearly no ground for such an

exception; for all are equally mentioned by Demosthenes to designate a date, and therefore all must be equally regarded as archons eponymi of Athens. Dr. Hincks might have learnt from my *Archons of Athens* that I was quite aware that Meursius, Palmer, Corsini and Clinton held that these archons of Demosthenes, which are not found in Diodorus, were not archons eponymi: but they took it for granted that there were no more years between the end of the Peloponnesian war and the death of Alexander than are given by Diodorus, and that, as Diodorus had given an archon eponymus for each year, there could have been no room for any more, and that, therefore, there could have been no more archons eponymi.

But against this view I produce testimony to shew that there were twenty-one years more during this period than are given by Diodorus. One of my witnesses is Africanus, as handed down by Syncellus; and in your p. 165 I say, "We learn from Julius Africanus that Creon was archon in 19 Ol. 3, that is, B.C. 702." Dr. Hincks meets this by a direct negative in your p. 414, saying, "We learn from him (Africanus) no such thing. He says that Creon was archon 903 years before Philinus, who presided in the first year of the 250th Olympiad, or A.D. 221. The archonship of Creon began, therefore, according to Africanus (as according to Eusebius and all modern chronologers, except Mr. Parker), in 683 B.C. Mr. Parker, however, substitutes 923 for 903. The latter is the reading of both the MSS. and of all the editions in the Greek text. Goar, however, the most stupid of editors, fancied that this must be a mistake, and he substituted 923 in his margin and in his Latin translation. Mr. Parker looked to the Latin version only, and was thus led into error. He makes a further mistake in attributing to Africanus the statement that Creon was archon in the 19th Olympiad, but called by others the 25th. These statements, as well as the mundane date 4801, are due to *Syncellus*, and, I need scarcely say, *his* chronological statements have no value whatever."

Thus we are at direct issue as to what we learn from this passage in Syncellus, and that your readers may judge between us I give the passage in full. In his *Chronographia*, p. 212, Syncellus says, "Down to the year 4801 from Adam, there were seventeen of the first kings of Athens, and after them there were thirteen for life called archons: then there were seven for ten years each, in all thirty-seven, who held the government of Athens from the year of the world 3945, and ceased when they had continued for 856 entire years. After these there were found among the patricians yearly archons, and the government of nine archons was established at Athens. The government of the yearly archons was set up in the the year of the world 4801. Creon was chosen the first archon in the 19th Olympiad, but others say in the 25th. From his time to the 250th Olympiad there were 903 (*in the margin*, 923) archons down to Philinus, in whose time Gratus Severianus and Seleucus were the Roman consuls. From the consuls in the time of Brutus, after the kings, there were numbered 725 down to the year of the

world 5723, according to Africanus, which was the third year of the Roman king, Antoninus Augustus."

I do not assume that Syncellus took his years of the world, 4801, 5723, from Africanus; for the year 4801 is evidently a continuation of his account of the world from his immediately preceding date of A.M. 4791, as the beginning of the decennial archonship of Eryxias. But, as the great object of Syncellus in this passage was to carry on his history of the world from A.M. 4801 to A.M. 5723, I hold that the authority of Africanus may reasonably be considered as intended to be applied to the account given of the archons, and not merely confined to the account given of the consuls, who embraced only a part of the interval. But I need not insist upon this, as my concern is more for the statement itself than for the authority upon which it is made. No one will suspect that the account here given of the archons by Syncellus was an invention of his own. He must have had the tradition from some old authority, and the author, whoever he was, was plainly contending that the archonship of Creon began in the 19th Olympiad, and not in the 25th, as held by others; and the simple question is, What is the right reading for the number of archons between the 19th Olympiad and the 250th Olympiad? Is it 903, as given in the text and contended for by Dr. Hincks, or is it 923, as given in the margin and in the Latin version by Goar and adopted by myself? 250 Ol. 1=997th Olympic year, and 19 Ol. 3=75th Olympic year, and the number of years between these two dates (997 and 75, both inclusive) is clearly 923 and not 903. There must also have been the same interval between A.M. 4801, when Creon was archon, and A.M. 5723, in which Philinus was archon. Thus the tradition itself (whether true or false) is exactly that which I have represented it to be, and may clearly be applied, as I have applied it in your pages, to shew that there was room for the additional archons of Demosthenes. That this tradition as to Creon, which gives twenty-one additional years to the kingdom of Athens, came from Africanus, is rendered not improbable by the circumstance that, in another place, as I have also noticed in your pages, Africanus gives twenty-one additional years to the kingdom of Persia by placing the end of the seventy years' captivity at Babylon, that is, the twenty-first year of Cyrus, in 55 Ol. 1.

But the probability of the truth of these two traditions would be much increased if they came from separate and independent testimonies. Thus my position would rather gain than lose by my admitting that I was wrong as to the tradition respecting Creon having been handed down by Africanus.

Further: Dr. Hincks also says that all other writers, except myself, think that Africanus places the termination of the captivity in the first year of Cyrus in Persia, twenty-two years before his capture of Babylon, "either through a gross mistake, or, as seems more probable, in order, by a 'pious fraud,' to support his favourite theory as to Biblical chronology." Thus, according to Dr. Hincks, the chronological statements of Syncellus have no value whatever,

and Africanus could make a "gross mistake," or commit a "pious fraud;" and so, according to Dr. Hincks, there would not be much room to choose between the two. That Africanus has handed down traditions which are contradictory is not to be denied. He has handed down a tradition that the 20th of Artaxerxes was the 115th year of the kingdom of Persia and in the fourth year of the 83rd Olympiad. Dr. Hincks says that I have strangely overlooked this passage; but he may have seen it (with the omission of the Olympiad) in my *Archons of Athens*, p. 14, as taken from Jerome; and he may see it in full in my *Chronology*, p. 441, as taken from Jerome and Syncellus. According to this tradition, the first of Cyrus's thirty years in Persia must have been in 55 Ol. 2; and so the end of the seventy years' captivity, that is, the twenty-first of Cyrus, could not have been in 55 Ol. 1, as stated in his other tradition. Of course, one or other of these two traditions must be wrong; but, by means of this last tradition of Africanus, I am able to shew that Diodorus has, in effect, also handed down to us the same two contradictory traditions, and they may be best seen by illustration, as follows:—

Fig. I.

	Media.		B.C.
First of Deioeces	150 years	17 Ol. 2.	711.
Last of Astyages		54 Ol. 3.	562.
Fall of Babylon			
Persia. Fall of Cyrus	21 y.	55 Ol. 2.	559.
21st of Cyrus		60 Ol. 2.	539.
6th of Darius Cod.	208 y.	112 Ol. 2.	331.

Fig. II.

	Media.		B.C.
First of Deioeces	20 Ol. 1.		700
	150 y.		
		1st of Cyrus	Persia. 55 Ol. 2. 559
		Larissa Ecl.	" " 4. 557
Last of Astyages	57 Ol. 2.		551.
		Fall of Croesus	58 Ol.
Fall of Babylon		22nd of Cyrus	60 Ol. 3. 538
		6th of Darius	112 Ol. 2. 331

Fig. III.

	Media.		B.C.
First of Deioeces	17 Ol. 2.		711
	150 y.		
		1st of Cyrus	Persia. 50 Ol. 1. 580
Last of Astyages	54 Ol. 3.		562
		21st of Cyrus	55 Ol. 1. 560
Fall of Babylon		Larissa Ecl.	" " 4. 557
		6th of Darius	112 Ol. 2. 331

As Dr. Hincks observes, the first of Xerxes was, according to Africanus, the 75th year of the Persian empire, or 73 Ol. 4. This would agree with Diodorus (*lib. xi. 1*), in placing the expedition of Xerxes into Greece in the archonship of Calliades and in 75 Ol. 1, as appears in the *Extended Table* of my *Chronology*. Thus Diodorus may be considered as holding with the tradition of Africanus, which would place the first of Cyrus's thirty years in 55 Ol. 2, as in *Figs. I., II.*

In opposition to this, in p. 170 of your number for April, I have shewn that, according to Diodorus, the first year of Deioces, king of Media, was in 17 Ol. 2, B.C. 711, and, therefore, the last year of Astyages, which, according to Herodotus, was the 150th year of the Median empire, must have been in B.C. 562, that is, 54 Ol. 3 (*See Figs. I., III.*)

Now this is clearly inconsistent with the other tradition, that the first of Cyrus's thirty years' reign in Persia was in 55 Ol. 2. For, according to this account, the kingdom of Media must have come to an end before Cyrus became king of Persia, as an ordinary kingdom. The account of Herodotus (*Olio*) is that Babylon was conquered by Cyrus, as king of Persia, and that he had conquered Cræsus, king of the Lydians, before he conquered Babylon, and conquered Astyages, the last king of the Medes, before he conquered Cræsus.

The same two contradictory traditions are also handed down by Eusebius. Thus, in his *Chronicon*, p. 126, Eusebius places the last year of Astyages in 54 Ol. 4, and the first of Cyrus's thirty years in Persia in 55 Ol. 1 (*See Fig. 1*). But Eusebius makes the contradiction still more apparent by saying, immediately after his 54 Ol. 4, that Cyrus overthrew the Median empire and reigned over Persia, having conquered Astyages, king of the Medes, and released the Jews from their captivity.

Dan. ii. gives an account of four *universal* kingdoms:—I. The head of Nebuchadnezzar's image, of fine gold—Babylon. II. His breast and arms, of silver—Persia. III. His belly and thighs, of brass—Greece. IV. His legs, of iron; his feet, part of iron and part of clay—Rome. Nor can it be doubted that Cyrus was king of Persia many years before Persia became the *universal* kingdom on the overthrow of Babylon. And thus the kingdoms of Babylon and of Persia (as an ordinary kingdom), like the kingdoms of Media and of Persia (as an ordinary kingdom), must have overlapped each other, as shewn in *Figs. II., III.*, and not merely followed each other, as represented by the two traditions handed down both by Diodorus and Eusebius, and shewn in *Fig. I.*

Eusebius, in his *Chronicon*, p. 128, says that, according to some, the seventy years' captivity ended in the 20th of Cyrus, and the Canon of Ptolemy gives only nine years to Cyrus, that is, his supposed years after his conquest of Babylon; and the only question is, whether the ends of the kingdoms of Media and of Babylon are to be brought down below 55 Ol. 1, as in *Fig. II.*, or whether the beginning of Cyrus's thirty years in Persia is to be carried up above 54 Ol. 3, as in *Fig. III.* Blair has placed the first of Cyrus's thirty years in

55 Ol. 2, and brought down the last year of Astyages to 57 Ol. 2, the 9th of Cyrus, and placed the overthrow of Croesus in 58 Ol. 1, the 12th of Cyrus, and placed the overthrow of Babylon in 60 Ol. 3, the 22nd of Cyrus, as seen in *Fig. II.*

But if the tradition of Diodorus as to the reign of Deioces, (and which, with the testimony of Herodotus, would place the last year of Astyages in 54 Ol. 3,) is to be sustained, the arrangement of Blair must be rejected, and the beginning of Cyrus's thirty years in Persia must be carried up above 54 Ol. 3; so that the first year of Cyrus's reign in Persia, which was in 55 Ol. 1, must have been the first year of his reign in Persia as the *universal* kingdom, on the fall of Babylon, that is to say, the 21st of Cyrus's thirty years' reign in Persia must have been in 55 Ol. 1, according to the tradition of Africanus.

Under this supposition, the first of Cyrus's thirty years in Persia must have been in 50 Ol. 1; and, in accordance with this, we have Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, xxxvi. 4, saying, "Dipœnus and Scyllis, natives of Crete, were the first who were celebrated for marble sculpture even in the reign of the Medes, before Cyrus began to reign in Persia, that is, in the 50th Olympiad." Further: if the reign of Cyrus in Persia began in 50 Ol. 1, and the kingdom of Persia ended, as all admit, when Alexander conquered Darius Codom, in 112 Ol. 2, the duration of the kingdom must have been, not merely 229 years, according to Diodorus and the common chronology, but 250 years. In perfect accordance with this, we have Strabo (xv. 851) and Sulpitius Severus (l. ii., c. 17) stating that its duration was 250 years. Further: if the duration of the kingdom was twenty-one years more than are assigned to it by Diodorus, some one or more of its kings must have reigned more years than are given by Diodorus. In perfect accordance with this, we have Plutarch (*Artaxerxes*, 1027) and Sulpitius Severus (ii. 13) giving to Artaxerxes Memor sixty-two years instead of the forty-three years which are assigned to him by Diodorus (xiii. 108, xv. 93), and Artaxerxes began to reign just at the end of the Peloponnesian war.

Now all these testimonies would make the desired room for the additional archons of Demosthenes, and make it highly probable that they were all archons eponymi; and, on the other hand, the certainty that they were archons eponymi would add greatly to the probability that all these concurring testimonies were true.

Further: to defend the tradition of Diodorus as to Deioces, I may produce the testimony of Dr. Hincks himself; and thus we shall not only have Syncellus *v.* Syncellus, and Africanus *v.* Africanus, and Eusebius *v.* Eusebius, and Diodorus *v.* Diodorus, but also Dr. Hincks *v.* Dr. Hincks.

In my *Chronology*, pp. 386—393, I have shewn that the most probable year, on historical grounds, for the eclipse, which terminated the Median and Lydian war, was the thirty-fourth year of Cyaxares, king of Media, the immediate predecessor of Astyages; and, if the first year of Deioces was in 17 Ol. 2, according to Diodorus the thirty-fourth year of Cyaxares, the 109th year of the

Median kingdom, according to Herodotus, must have been in 44 Ol. 2, B.C. 608; and in my last letter I noticed that Dr. Hincks entertained no doubt, on astronomical grounds, that the eclipse of 18th May, B.C. 603, was the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war.

In your p. 411, Dr. Hincks says, "As to the eclipse predicted by Thales, no one, I suppose, doubts that it was that which occurred on the 28th of May, 585 B.C. I certainly never doubted it, though Mr. Parker brings me prominently forward as doing so. I deny, however, that it was the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war. I think that Herodotus was mistaken in identifying this last eclipse with that predicted by Thales; and I suggested, at the meeting of the British Association in 1856, that Herodotus was led into this mistake by his having heard that Thales had predicted the eclipse of 585 from his knowing that the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war had occurred in 603." This passage is certainly the first thing that has excited my suspicion that Dr. Hincks or any one else ever made any distinction between the eclipse of Thales and the eclipse that terminated the Lydian war. I have now before me three papers of February 3rd, 1853 (*Philosop. Trans.*); of June 12th, 1857; of March 12th, 1858; by the Astronomer Royal, G. B. Airy, Esq., on the *Eclipse of Thales*. In each of these papers the eclipse is dealt with as being the eclipse that terminated the Lydian war; and the date contended for by Mr. Airy is 28th May, B.C. 585. In your number for January, 1857, p. 463, Dr. Hincks says, "He (Mr. Bosanquet) says that Mr. Airy has *proved* that the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war occurred on the 28th May, 585 B.C.; and that, as Cyaxares was king of Media at the time of that eclipse, the received chronology, by which he was at least ten years dead, must be false. If Mr. Airy had really *proved* what Mr. Bosanquet says that he has proved, it would, I grant, be impossible to maintain the received chronology; but I deny the fact. Mr. Airy has *asserted* it, but he has given no proof of his assertion. I say this with the full knowledge of the paper on this eclipse that Mr. Airy has published in the *Philosophical Transactions*, the most inconclusive paper on a mathematical subject which I have ever perused. Mr. Airy sets out with an hypothesis, which is not only arbitrary, but, in the highest degree, improbable, not to say absurd; and on this hypothesis his entire argument rests. Deny the hypothesis, and the whole of what he says in support of his position comes to nought." A little further on Dr. Hincks says, "I myself, however, entertain no doubt that the eclipse of 18th May, 603 B.C., was that which terminated the Lydian war." Now, from this we must conclude that Dr. Hincks was perfectly aware that Mr. Airy was contending for the eclipse of 28th May, 585 B.C., as being not merely the eclipse which terminated the Median and Lydian war, but also as being the eclipse of Thales. Nor can I find in this paper of Dr. Hincks' a single syllable which could excite the least suspicion that Dr. Hincks then entertained the distinction which he now says that he suggested to the British Association in 1856; and



as he contended that the eclipse, which he must have known Mr. Airy was contending for as the eclipse of Thales, as well as the eclipse that terminated the Lydian war, was in B.C. 603, and not in B.C. 585, as contended for by Mr. Airy, I presume your readers would have held me excused, if I had brought Dr. Hincks prominently forward, as he says I have done, as doubting that the eclipse predicted by Thales was that which occurred on the 28th May, 585 B.C. I certainly did consider that Dr. Hincks' saying, without any explanation, that the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war was in B.C. 603, was equivalent to saying that the eclipse of Thales was not in B.C. 585. But what I have really done has been carefully to produce Dr. Hincks' own words, giving his opinion that the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war occurred in B.C. 603; and, with the explanation which he has now given, it is nothing to the purpose for him to say that certainly he never had doubted that the eclipse predicted by Thales occurred on the 28th May, 585 B.C. The question which Dr. Hincks has not answered is, Does he now doubt, on astronomical grounds, that the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war was in B.C. 603? Dr. Hincks might have said in his paper in 1857 that he agreed with Mr. Airy as to the eclipse of Thales being in B.C. 585, but that he did not agree with him as to the way in which he attempted to prove it; for, that the data of Herodotus as to the Lydian war employed by Mr. Airy had reference to a prior eclipse, which led to the prediction of Thales, and, if dealt with properly, would give, astronomically, a result of B.C. 603, instead of B.C. 585. Dr. Hincks may or may not hold the distinction for which he contends; but this contest between him and Mr. Airy must surely be regarded by your readers merely as a contest as to who is the best astronomer. My object is to confirm, if possible, by astronomical as well as by historical evidence, the tradition of Diodorus as to the first year of Deioces being in 17 Ol. 2, B.C. 711; and the astronomical testimony of Dr. Hincks as to the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war, and which he has not yet ventured to contradict, gives it, as I have shewn, a very striking confirmation; but I must still say that the weight of his opinion is very much diminished by the circumstance that it is not supported by the Astronomer Royal: and surely what Dr. Hincks has allowed himself to say of Mr. Airy cannot tend to create in your readers a confidence in the calculation of distant eclipses for the determination of chronology, especially in opposition to the concurring testimonies of such unconnected and unbiassed witnesses as Demosthenes, Strabo, Pliny and Plutarch. That there was a large eclipse of the sun in B.C. 603 is not doubted on astronomical grounds, whether it can be proved by astronomical calculation that it corresponded with the particulars given by Herodotus or not.

Thus, not only has Dr. Hincks failed in shewing either that the additional archons of Demosthenes were not archons eponymi, or that I have dealt unfaithfully with the tradition in Syncellus as to Creon, which would make room for them; but also the testimonies

which I have produced to prove the truth of the tradition are such as not to be set aside lightly. Dr. Hincks may charge Africanus with committing "*a pious fraud*" in order to support his favourite theory as to Biblical chronology; but no such charge can be brought against Lysias, Demosthenes, Strabo, Diodorus, Pliny, or Plutarch, nor is it easy to understand how their strict concurrence in support of Africanus could have arisen, except on the supposition that they were all speaking the truth. That Diodorus has fallen into error in respect to the Olympic years in which he has placed his archons, need not excite our surprise when we hear Plutarch (*Numa*, i. 60) saying, "It is difficult to collect the times accurately, and especially those which are deduced from Olympiads." It is also easy to conceive that Diodorus may have mistaken the first year of Cyrus in Persia, as an *ordinary* kingdom, for the first of his reign in Persia, as one of the four *universal* kingdoms, as being in 55 Ol. 1.

In your page 415, Dr. Hincks also says in reference to the period in dispute, "Anything is preferable to tampering with the received chronology of this period, which is as certain as that of modern English history." Your readers must judge how far Dr. Hincks is justified in this statement after the testimonies which I have produced against it. Their verdict may be that if there be a certainty in the matter, the certainty is according to my view of it. Galileo was imprisoned for supporting the system of Copernicus as to the revolution of the earth around the sun.

With respect to Creon, Dr. Hincks also represents me in your page 414 as saying, "Dionysius must have agreed with Africanus (or rather with me) in placing this archonship in 702; and, *therefore*, he must have placed the building of Rome in 772." I have never said, nor meant to imply anything of the kind. In your page 169, I said, "We learn from Dionysius (*Ha.*, i., 57) that Rome was built when Charops was archon at Athens for the first of his ten years. Charops was first of the seven decennial archons who immediately preceded Creon. Hence, with Creon in 19 Ol. 3, *i. e.*, B.C. 702, Rome must have been built in B.C. 772. But Dionysius also says that, according to Polybius, it was built in 7 Ol. 2, *i. e.*, B.C. 751. Here again we have a variation of twenty-one years." I had previously shewn that, according to Africanus, Creon was archon in 19 Ol. 3, and the sole object of my reference to Dionysius, in regard to Creon, was to shew the interval between him and the building of Rome. Dionysius, like other writers, may be right as to the intervals which they have given between certain events, and yet wrong in regard to the Olympic years in which they placed those events in their chronological systems, and doubtless it was this that led Plutarch to say, "It is difficult to collect the times accurately, and especially those which are deduced from the Olympiads," and this should be especially borne in mind by chronologists now in their endeavours rightly to distinguish between the right and wrong traditions which have been handed down, and oftentimes by the same writer and in the same sentences.

In your page 413, Dr. Hincks also says, "Mr. Parker cites a great number of writers; but of these very few, when correctly quoted and properly interpreted, will be found to favour his views. Of the few that do so, it may suffice to say, that they are mistaken. Their evidence is perfectly worthless when weighed against that which I have adduced in favour of the common chronology." My work on *Chronology* extends to 820 pages in octavo, in addition to an *Extended Table* in folio. In this *Table* I give a line for a year and authority for every date, from the birth of Abraham A.M. 1948 to the first of Gordian A.M. 4381, A.D. 238, and in some pages there are not less than twenty columns. To have done this I must necessarily have cited a great number of writers, and I am quite willing to have my treatment of the quotations from them, which Dr. Hincks has criticized, taken as specimens of the manner in which I have quoted and interpreted the others, and also taken as a guide for the judgment of your readers as to the probability that the very many, among whom I have shewn a most extraordinary concurrence, could possibly have been all mistaken.

I must now turn to the evidence adduced by Dr. Hincks in favour of the common chronology. I. The eclipses of Thucydides. II. The eclipses of Ptolemy. III. The Metonic cycle, and the Calippic period.

I. As to the eclipses of Thucydides.—These are said by Thucydides to have occurred in certain years of the Peloponnesian war. As I have already noticed, according to the united testimony of Lysias, Demosthenes, and the Arundel Marble, the war could not have taken place in the years commonly assigned to it; but I must add a few words.

In reference to the Marble date for Euctemon the archon, in the twenty-fourth year of the war, Dr. Hincks says in your page 414, "I do not think that Mr. Parker has proved that 147 is a better reading than 144; but I have no interest in the question. That the sculptor of the Marble has made mistakes I have no doubt; and I suspect that the copyist made others. Which of them made the mistake in this instance is of no importance whatever. It is certain, however, that one or other of them has done so. If 144 were not the date on the Marble, it ought to have been so."

After this fashion any testimony may be set aside; but I must not be turned from the point, as it is one of great interest, when the date of the Peloponnesian war is at issue. I doubt not that your readers will decide that I have already clearly proved that 147 is the proper reading for this date, and this would give 144 for the end of the war.

Demosthenes (*Orat.* ix.; *Phil.* iii., 116) says to the Athenians, "You held the sovereignty of Greece seventy-three years." This sovereignty may well be considered as having begun from the year of the battle of Plataea, when the Athenians gained the victory over the Persians, in the archonship of Xantippus, and as having ended at the year of the battle of Ægospotamos, when the Athenian fleet

was destroyed by Lysander, the Lacedemonian commander, in the archonship of Alexias. The Marble places Xantippus in its 216th year, and seventy-three years reckoned from this would reach the end of number 143 (the archonship of Callias on the Marble); and, according to Diodorus, Alexias was the next archon to Callias, and so 142 would be his year on the Marble. Diodorus also agrees exactly with the Marble, as to the interval between Xantippus and Alexias; and as Callias, the next before Alexias, was 143, Euctemon could not have been 144, because Antigenes was between them, according to Diodorus, as well as according to the Marble.

With this singular confirmation of Demosthenes and Diodorus of 144 not being the right reading for the date of Euctemon, I dare not doubt, on the united testimony of Lysias, Demosthenes, and the Marble, that the Peloponnesian war must have been, at the least, three years before the date assigned to it by Diodorus and the common chronology. This would, of course, decide that the eclipse of the moon, of the 28th Aug. B.C. 413, could not have been the eclipse in the nineteenth year of the war to which Thucydides refers. But, in your p. 412, Dr. Hincks says, "In that year (B.C. 413), 28th August, the moon was totally eclipsed; but it is certain that three years before, or twenty-one years before, she could not have been eclipsed at all."

As I have noticed in my *Chronology*, p. 781, Suidas states that the first Olympiad was 460 years after the taking of Troy, and I have interpreted this as being exclusive of the first year of the first Olympiad, and have thus regarded the 494th year of the Marble as the first Olympic year; but, if I had interpreted the 460 years as inclusive of the first Olympic year, then the 495th year of the Marble would be the first Olympic year; the 147th year of the Marble era, the archonship of Euctemon, and the twenty-fourth year of the war, would be 88 Ol. 1, B.C. 428, instead of 87 Ol. 4, B.C. 429, and the nineteenth year of the war would be B.C. 433, instead of B.C. 434: and *L'Art de Verif. les Dates* gives an eclipse of the moon on September 8, B.C. 433. The eighth year of the war, in which, according to Thucydides, there was an eclipse of the sun, would be B.C. 444. In this year, according to the *Table*, there was an eclipse of the sun 30th April. The supposed eclipse was 21st March, B.C. 424. The first year of the war, in which, according to Thucydides, there was also an eclipse of the sun, would be B.C. 451, and in this year there was an eclipse of the sun, according to the *Table*, on the 20th March. The supposed eclipse was 3rd August, B.C. 431.

As to how far these several eclipses may be sustained, it will be for astronomers to decide, when they shall have agreed amongst themselves as to the elements to be employed in the calculation.

II. I now turn to the eclipses of Ptolemy. In reference to the archonships of Phanostratus and Menander having been in 383-382 B.C., as determined by the three eclipses of the moon, which are said, in the *Almagest* of Ptolemy, to have occurred in their archonships, Dr. Hincks, in your p. 410, says: "Against this Mr. Parker can find

nothing to say ; but he throws some dust in the eyes of the ignorant by talking of the discord among astronomers as to the eclipse of Thales, and of Professor Adams' discovery that there was an error in the calculation previously made of the quantity of the moon's acceleration ;—all which is absolutely beside the question. No astronomer has ever doubted that the three eclipses, recorded as having occurred in the archonship of Phanostratus and his successor, occurred on the days above mentioned. I challenge Mr. Parker to produce a single one of his 'astronomical friends' who will commit himself to the opinion that these facts admit of rational doubt ; or that any uncertainty, which has ever been supposed to exist, as to the amount of the moon's acceleration, could have the slightest bearing on the question." I trust I have too great regard for my hands to defile them by the throwing of dust, and so the fear of the imputation need not deter me from producing some more words from my astronomical friend. I suspect, too, that they will be regarded by some as being something more than small dust in the balance. On the 20th August, 1858, my friend writes : "He (Professor Adams) makes the secular acceleration of the moon's motion less, by nearly half, than the received value. I have gone through all the nineteen eclipses of Ptolemy, and it is certain that to diminish the secular acceleration by one half would utterly overthrow all the *system* of these Ptolemeans. *Some* of the eclipses might bear it, but the 'set' would be destroyed. I send you Ptolemy's *statements*, and *my results*. On the whole I cannot see how to disturb them." On the 18th March, 1861, my friend writes : "As I have already set forth, there is something yet to be discovered before we can calculate our old eclipses consistently with each other, and with the new value of the acceleration." On the 22nd January, 1863, my friend writes : "I imagine the astronomers have somewhat lost confidence in the exactness of their calculations of ancient eclipses by reason of the uncertainty of the secular acceleration. The discoveries of Adams have made me irresolute in affirming the certainty of our present determinations. He leaves us in a 'regular mess' (I think), and plainly says, 'Your value of the acceleration is too large—in the proportion of 3 to 5.' " Nor need I condescend to throw dust in the eyes of the ignorant. The unmeasured language which Dr. Hincks has allowed himself to use towards Mr. Airy must have opened their eyes so fully, as to see plainly that the calculation of very distant eclipses must be a matter of great uncertainty ; or, how could such great men as Dr. Hincks and Mr. Airy be at issue in respect to it. If such an astronomer as Mr. Airy can (I will not say write, but) be charged by such an astronomer as Dr. Hincks with writing an absurd or inconclusive paper on the calculation of an eclipse, common sense must tell us that there must be something very inconclusive in the elements to be employed, and surely the ignorant in astronomy may reasonably expect the learned to be thoroughly agreed amongst themselves as to the elements to be employed in their calculations before their calculations can be received with any confidence. But the

great objection to the eclipses of Ptolemy (I speak of the first ten, which are supposed to have been recorded at Babylon), and especially to these three which Dr. Hincks has produced, as having occurred in the archonships of Phanostratus and Menander, is not that there were not eclipses of the moon on the days and in the years to which these eclipses of Ptolemy are assigned, but that the years in which they are said to have occurred could not have been in the reigns to which they are assigned in Ptolemy, and that the evidence by which they are assigned to the reigns in which they are placed in Ptolemy is very far from being conclusive, and that the eclipses assigned to Phanostratus and Menander could not have occurred in their archonships; that the two eclipses of 23rd December, B.C. 383, and 18th June, B.C. 382, could not, both of them, have been in the single archonship of any one, who was archon either in 383 or 382. Ptolemy, in his *Almagest*, lib. iv., c. 11, p. 105, in reference to these three eclipses, says, "He (Hipparchus) says that these three eclipses were brought from Babylon, as having been observed there; and that the first (*i. e.*, the eighth of Ptolemy's) took place when Phanostratus was archon at Athens." In the same page, Ptolemy says of the ninth eclipse, "Again, he (Hipparchus) says that an eclipse took place when Phanostratus was archon at Athens." In his p. 106, Ptolemy says of the tenth eclipse, "But he (Hipparchus) says that the third eclipse took place when Evander was archon at Athens." The tradition is that these eclipses were observed at Babylon, and if, in the record of them made at Babylon at the time, the names of Phanostratus and Evander had been given, it would still be incredible that the eclipses actually occurred, as stated, in the archonships of Phanostratus and Evander. I have already suggested the great improbability that the name of an archon eponymus at Delphi should be given as a date in an Athenian court of justice; but, much more improbable is it that the names of archons of Athens should be inserted in a record at Babylon as the dates of eclipses which were observed and recorded at Babylon. The conclusion is obvious. The archonships of Phanostratus and Evander must have been given as the dates at some other place and at some other time, and the person who substituted them for the dates which were given in the original records, must have been in error. Ptolemy gives Hipparchus as his authority; and we learn from the *Almagest*, vii., c. 2, that Hipparchus made astronomical observations so late as the fiftieth year of the third Calippic period, that is, B.C. 128, 163 Ol. 1, that is, 196 years after the death of Alexander, according to Ptolemy. In his p. 102, Ptolemy says of his seventh eclipse, "We have taken the eclipse which was in the time of the first Darius, and was observed at Babylon in his thirty-first year." Of course, it is incredible that Darius, the son of Hystaspes, could have been called the first Darius before another Darius had come to the throne of Persia, and consequently this statement could not have been in the original record of the eclipse. In his p. 102, Ptolemy says of his sixth eclipse, "The second eclipse, which Hipparchus used, took place in the twentieth of Darius, who

came after Cambyases." Of course, it is quite improbable that it should have been stated in the original record of this eclipse that Darius came after Cambyases, even if it were true that the twentieth of Darius was named in it as the date. The conclusion is that the twentieth of Darius also is only a substitution for the original date. In his p. 125, Ptolemy says of his fifth eclipse, "And again, in the seventh of Cambyases, which is the 225th year from Nabonasarus, from the seventeenth to the eighteenth in the Egyptian Phamenoth, one hour before midnight the moon was eclipsed at Babylon." As we learn that Darius, who came after Cambyases, took Babylon a second time after it had been previously taken by Cyrus, and that he levelled the walls and took away the gates, neither of which things Cyrus had done before, it is not at all probable that an astronomer at Babylon should give the reign of Cambyases as the date of an eclipse which he had observed there. The conclusion is that this, like all the other preceding dates which are given by Ptolemy, are only substitutions for other dates in the original records. Nor does Ptolemy give Hipparchus as the authority for the dates of his fifth, sixth, and seventh eclipses. Thus, he merely says of his sixth eclipse, "The second eclipse, which Hipparchus used, took place in the twentieth of Darius." We may, however, concede that these dates were also given by Hipparchus; but Lysias lived in the time of the Peloponnesian war; Demosthenes, in the time of Philip; and the author of the Arundel Marble lived about 150 years before the time of Hipparchus; and by each of these I prove most conclusively that neither the archonships of Phanostratus and Menander, nor the reigns of Cambyases and Darius, could have been in the years B.C. in which these eclipses of Ptolemy, that are respectively assigned to them, are said to have occurred.

I now turn to the Metonic cycle and Calippic period. In your Journal (p. 411) Dr. Hincks says, "The archon before Pythodorus was Apseudes. In his archonship, Meton, having discovered the cycle of nineteen years which bears his name, procured a law at Athens that his arrangement of the calendar, in respect to intercalary years and exemptile days, should commence at the new moon following the summer solstice of that year. Accordingly, the next year, when Pythodorus was archon, was the first year of the Metonic cycle. It was also a year in which the Olympic games were celebrated, because the Metonic cycle was proclaimed at the games which immediately followed its commencement. The archonship of Pythodorus had, therefore, two characteristics; it was the first year of an Olympiad and the first year of a Metonic cycle. Now, it is notorious that the year which began in the summer of 432 had these two characteristics, and that neither that which began in 435 nor that which began in 453 had either the one or the other of them. Mr. Parker has not ventured to say a single word in reply to this argument, which I brought forward in my former paper, although it is *absolutely conclusive*."

In your page 412, Dr. Hincks also says, "Again, Aristarchus

(cited by Ptolemy in his *Almagest*, pp. 162, 163) says, that he observed the summer solstice at the end of the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period, being the forty-fourth year from the death of Alexander, that is, in June 280, as all must admit; and he says that this was 152 years after the observation of the solstice by Meton in the archonship of Apseudes, in the morning of the twenty-first of Phamenoth, that is, on the 27th of June, 432. Mr. Parker, strangely enough, overlooks this testimony of a writer who lived nearer to the time of which he speaks than any of those whom he cites, and who had doubtless obtained the best evidence which was then available on the subject. If this single evidence stood alone it would, in my judgment, outweigh all the evidence on which Mr. Parker relies."

I must first notice the extraordinary manner in which Dr. Hincks here contradicts himself. He says that the observation of the solstice by Meton was in the archonship of Apseudes, 27th of June, 432. This plainly places the beginning of the cycle in the archonship of Apseudes; but Dr. Hincks also says that the next year, when Pythodorus was archon, was the first year of the Metonic cycle. But how could the cycle begin in the archonship of Apseudes, and also in the archonship of Pythodorus, in the following year?

Further, if the year in which Pythodorus was archon was the first year of an Olympiad, and if B.C. 432 was the first year of an Olympiad, Pythodorus must have been archon in 432. How then could 432 be the year in which Apseudes was archon? It may be that I can explain the origin of this strange confusion by shewing that, according to Diodorus, the summer solstice of 432 B.C. was in the archonship of Pythodorus, but that, according to Ptolemy, it was in the archonship of Apseudes. Happily, I have not overlooked the testimony of Ptolemy in this matter, and shall produce from my *Chronology* (p. 369) an extract, giving the words of Ptolemy as translated by myself, "In lib. iii., 2, p. 63, Ptolemy says that the summer solstice was observed in the time of Meton and Euctemon, and he adds, 'This is recorded to have taken place in the morning of the twenty-first of the Ægyptian Phamenoth, when Apseudes was archon at Athens,' . . . 'and there are from the said recorded summer solstice in the time of Apseudes to the one observed in the time of Aristarchus, in the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period, 152 years, as Hipparchus says (καθὼς καὶ ὁ Ἰππάρχος φησὶν), and the said fiftieth year was forty-four years from the death of Alexander.'" Also "In his *Almagest* (iii., 8, p. 79) Ptolemy says, 'From the reign of Nabonassar to the death of Alexander there were 424 years, and from the death of Alexander to the reign of Augustus there were 294 years.'" Thus, according to these words of Ptolemy, the statement, that the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period was 152 years after the archonship of Apseudes, came from Hipparchus and not Aristarchus. Dr. Hincks says plainly that it came from Aristarchus, and surely this misrepresentation is quite unpardonable,—more so than his failing to calculate that the interval between 19 Ol. 3 and



250 Ol. 1, and also between A.M. 4801 and A.M. 5723, was 923, and not 903 years, as stated in Syncellus. Here we have the express statement, "*as Hipparchus says*;" nor does Ptolemy represent Aristarchus as saying anything at all in this passage. Thus, the statement, whatever be its value, rests only on the authority of Hipparchus, who took observations 196 years after the death of Alexander, and 152 years after the observation of Aristarchus.

First, then, the 152 years to the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period, *i. e.*, the forty-fourth year from the death of Alexander, are to be reckoned from the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes. By the death of Alexander, Ptolemy, as we have just seen, must mean the 424th year of the era of Nabonasar. In his *Almagest* (lib. iv., c. 11) he gives the date of his eleventh eclipse of the moon as the 547th year of this era. This is fixed to be 201 B.C. by an eclipse of the moon, which took place B.C. 201, September 22. This would place the death of Alexander in the 424th year of the era in B.C. 324. This would place the observation of Aristarchus, forty-four years afterwards, in B.C. 280, as held by Dr. Hincks, and this would place the observation of the summer solstice by Meton, in the archonship of Apseudes, in B.C. 432. This is clearly to be deduced from Ptolemy's *Almagest*.

But Diodorus (xii. 37) says, "When Pythodorus was archon at Athens, the Eleians celebrated the 87th Olympiad." In his c. 36 (the annals of the preceding Olympic year), Diodorus says, "When Apseudes was archon at Athens, Meton published his cycle of nineteen years, taking its beginning from the thirteenth day of the Athenian month Scirophorion (5th of June)." Thus, according to Diodorus also, the cycle began from the summer solstice, in the archonship of Apseudes, who immediately preceded Pythodorus. But what is the date B.C. of 87 Ol. 1, in which Diodorus places the archonship of Pythodorus? Censorinus (*De Die Natali*, c. 21) says, "This year is the consulship of Ulpian and Pontianus, and the 1014th year from the first Olympiad, but reckoned from the days of summer on which the Olympic game is celebrated." Censorinus also calls the year the 986th year of the era of Nabonasar and the 562nd year from the death of Alexander. This clearly places the 1014th Olympic year (254 Ol. 2) in A.D. 238, and here it is placed by Blair. Censorinus also fixes this date by several other marks, which I have also shewn to be true in the *Extended Table* of my chronology. This may mean either that the 1014th Olympic year was completed, or that it only began in A.D. 238. If the former was the meaning, the first Olympic year must have begun in the summer of 777 B.C.; but if the latter be its meaning, the first Olympic year must have begun in the summer of 776 B.C., that is to say, there must have been 776 Olympic years (the 776th begun, but not ended) before the Christian era, A.D. 1. I shall assume this to be the meaning of Censorinus. Now 87 Ol. 1 (the archonship of Pythodorus) must have been the 345th Olympic year. Hence there must have been 344 Olympic years before it, and the Olympic year (87 Ol. 1), in which Pythodorus was

archon, must therefore have been the Olympic year which began in the summer of B.C. 432, and here it is placed by Blair. Thus I have shewn that, according to Diodorus, the summer solstice of B.C. 432 was in the archonship of Pythodorus, but that, according to Ptolemy, it was in the archonship of Apseudes. If, however, the first Olympic year began in the summer of B.C. 777, then 87 Ol. 1 must have begun in the summer of B.C. 433; but I presume no one will contend for this. Further; Ptolemy, in his iv. 11, places the archonship of Menander in the 367th year of Nabonassar, that is, fifty-seven years above his date for the death of Alexander (B.C. 324), that is, B.C. 381. But, according to Diodorus (xv. 20), it was in 99 Ol. 8, that is, as by our former process, B.C. 382.

Ptolemy also places the archonship of Phanostratus, in reference to both of the eclipses which are said to have occurred in it, in the 366th year of Nabonassar, that is, by our process, B.C. 382; but, according to Diodorus, it was in 99 Ol. 2, that is, by our process, B.C. 383. Thus we have Diodorus quite at variance with Ptolemy. Further: Ptolemy (iv. 9) places the thirty-first of Darius in the 257th year of Nabonassar, that is, 109 years above B.C. 382, his date for Phanostratus; that is to say, the thirty-first of Darius must have been, according to Ptolemy, in B.C. 491, and the eclipse, which is supposed to be the one to which he referred, occurred 25th April, B.C. 491. Also, Ptolemy places the twentieth of Darius in era Nab. 246, *i. e.*, eleven years above 491, that is, B.C. 502; and the supposed eclipse was 19th November, B.C. 502. He places the seventh of Cambyses in era Nab. 225, that is, twenty-one years above 246, or B.C. 502, *i. e.*, B.C. 523; and the supposed eclipse was in 16th July, B.C. 523. Thus Ptolemy is strictly consistent with himself, and therefore B.C. 382 must most certainly be held to be the year in which, according to Ptolemy, the archonship of Phanostratus occurred. The eclipses which are said to have been in his archonship are 23rd December, B.C. 383, and 18th June, B.C. 382. Of course, Phanostratus would have been archon 18th June, 382; but surely it is incredible that he was also archon 23rd December, 383.

According to Corsini (*Fast. Att.*, i. 11), the archontic year began in the month of Gamelion, that is, December or January. The month named by Ptolemy for the eclipse of December 23rd is Posideon, the attic month before Gamelion. According to Thucydides, the Peloponnesian war began early in the spring, two months before the end of the archonship of Pythodorus. Therefore his archonship must have begun late in the preceding spring, but before the summer days on which the Olympic games were celebrated; because, according to Diodorus, the Olympic games in that year were celebrated in his archonship. Further: if Phanostratus was archon for the year B.C. 383, he must have been archon for the summer of B.C. 383; and how can we believe that he was also in office on 18th June, 382? In like manner, B.C. 381 must, as we have seen, have been the year, according to Ptolemy, for the archonship of Menander; and how can we believe that he was also archon 12th

December, B.C. 382, in which the eclipse which is assigned to him occurred?

Further: we have seen Ptolemy placing the death of Alexander in B.N. 424, B.C. 324; but, I believe, no doubt exists that he did not die before the spring of B.C. 323; and this makes it quite improbable that Aristarchus, who lived at the time, should have stated that the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period was forty-four years from the death of Alexander; and Dr. Hincks should be more careful in his statements, as the testimony of Aristarchus upon the subject must have carried a weight which does not belong to Hipparchus, when compared with the early testimonies that I have produced.

It sometimes happens that a witness, produced by an unskilful advocate, on cross-examination overthrows the cause which he was called on to support. So it is with the Metonic cycle. The investigation into which it has led us has shewn that Ptolemy and Diodorus are at issue, not only with respect to the archonships of Apseudes and Pythodorus, but also with respect to the archonships of Phanostratus and Menander.

According to Ptolemy, the interval between the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes, and the summer solstice in the forty-fourth year after the death of Alexander, was only 152 years; but, according to Diodorus, it must have been 153 years. Both cannot be right; but both may be wrong. If Ptolemy be right as to the archonships of Pythodorus and Apseudes, Dr. Hincks would have the Metonic cycle in his favour; but, then, the plain inference would be that Diodorus must be wrong as to all the years of the Peloponnesian war; for the war began in the spring at the latter end of the archonship of Pythodorus, according to Thucydides. Thus, according to Diodorus, the first year of the war must have been from the spring of 431 B.C. to the spring of 430; the eighth year of the war must have been from the spring of 424 to the spring of 423; and the nineteenth year of the war must have been from the spring of 413 to the spring of 412; but, according to Ptolemy, the first year of the war must have been from the spring of 430 to the spring of 429; the eighth year must have been from the spring of 423 to the spring of 422; and the nineteenth year must have been from the spring of 412 to the spring of 411. This would, of course, throw out all the eclipses, which are supposed to be those referred to by Thucydides. The depression of Apseudes, from 433 to 432, and of Pythodorus, from 432 to 431, must necessarily depress the whole column of Diodorus' archons.

Further: the consistency of Ptolemy with himself requires that the archonship of Phanostratus should be, as we have noticed, in 382, instead of 383, as given by Diodorus, and the archonship of Menander in 381, instead of 382, as also given by Diodorus; and this depression would also be required, by the depression of Apseudes and Pythodorus, at the head of the continuous column; and if Phanostratus was archon in 382, then it is clear that the eclipse of 22nd December, 383, could not have been in his archonship; nor

could the eclipse of 12th December, 382, have been in the archonship of Menander, if he was archon in 381. Thus, if the Metonic cycle be in favour of Ptolemy, it is at the expense of losing the eclipses both of Thucydides and of the *Almagest*. On the other hand, if Diodorus be right as to the archonships of Phanostratus and Apseudes, the support of the Metonic cycle would be lost, and the eclipse of June 12, 382 (the 9th of the *Almagest*) would also be disturbed. We have learnt clearly from Censorinus that the Olympic games were celebrated in the beginning of the Olympic year, in the summer, and the account which Diodorus constantly gives of the first year of any Olympiad is, that when such an one was archon at Athens, such an Olympiad was celebrated; and if Phanostratus was archon in 383, as stated by Diodorus, the eclipse of 12th June, 382, could not have been in his archonship; for Menander, the archon in 382, must have been in office at the beginning of the Olympic year, that is, in the summer, in 382. As the Olympic year began in summer, the first half of each Olympic year must have been in one Julian year, and the last half in another Julian year; but when any one is spoken of as the archon of a year, it must be held to mean the archon who was in office in the summer of the year when the Olympic game was celebrated. Nor do we see any way of escape from these conclusions. Thus, the account of these three eclipses is in itself incredible, by whatever hand the regnal dates were inserted in the records; and thus we have ample ground not only for doubting the truth of the regnal dates which Ptolemy has assigned to all his several eclipses, but also for laying his whole system, as well as the chronology of Diodorus, open to correction by such early testimonies as I have produced.

Further: I have already noticed that by interpreting the 460 years, which the tradition of Suidas places between the Trojan war and the first Olympiad, as being inclusive, instead of exclusive, of the first Olympic year, the archonship of Euctemon, in the 147th year of the Marble era, would become 88 Ol. 1, *i. e.*, B.C. 428, instead of 87 Ol. 4, B.C. 429. The further effect of this change would be that the archonships of Pythodorus, in whose time the war began, and of Diotimus, and Isarchus, and Aristophylus, and Aristomnestes, and Callias, would each become the first year of an Olympiad, as required by Diodorus. The fourth and twelfth years of the war would also each become the first year of an Olympiad, as required by Thucydides (iii. 8, v. 49), and the variation between the common chronology and my own as to the interval between the end of the Peloponnesian war and the death of Alexander would be only twenty, instead of twenty-one years. Nor would my chronology be at all seriously affected by this change; and, surely, it will readily be admitted that it is at times very difficult to decide whether a given interval of years is intended to be exclusive or inclusive, either of one, or of both, of the termini. Dr. Hincks has rightly noticed that I ought to have given the number of years to be introduced after the archonship of Agathocles, as eighteen instead of fifteen. The number would now be seventeen.

Further: the depression of the archonship of Apseudes, as required by Ptolemy, to B.C. 432, and consequently of Pythodorus to B.C. 431, would, according to the rule which I have established, make Pythodorus the 346th archon, and so he would have been the archon of a second and not of the first year of an Olympiad, and thus his year of office would want one of the characteristics which Dr. Hincks and Diodorus both say must have belonged to it. Thus, I have something to say on the subject, though I did not venture (as Dr. Hincks says) to say a single word in my last letter in reply to his argument as to the Metonic cycle; and I have much more to say in a future letter on the connection of the Metonic cycle with the Calippic period as an indispensable test of a true chronology.

Further: the ten eclipses of Ptolemy, which are supposed to have been observed at Babylon, are also supposed to have occurred between 19th March, B.C. 721, and 12th December, B.C. 382, embracing a period of 339y. 351d. 1h. 30m. In my *Chronology* (p. 378) I give from *L'Art de Verifier les Dates* (4to, Paris, 1820), a list of ten other eclipses of the moon, extending from 29th March B.C. 768 to 21st December B.C. 429, and embracing a period of 339y. 351d. 2h. Further, it will be seen that the particulars of each of my ten eclipses agree so nearly with the particulars of the corresponding eclipse, as given by Ptolemy, as to time and magnitude, that it would be difficult in the present state of astronomy to say whether the eclipses of Ptolemy should be referred to the common list or to mine. In this we must bear in mind that my astronomical friend has said, "It is certain, that to diminish the secular acceleration by one half would utterly overthrow all the *system* of these Ptolemeans."

Further: the chronology of the *Almagest* is set forth in the canon of Ptolemy, as given in Dodwell's *Dissert. Cyprian*, and Vossii's *Chron. Sac.*, p. 132. In this the first of Cyrus's nine years after his overthrow of Babylon, is placed 215 years above the death of Alexander, *i. e.*, in B.C. 538, 60 Ol. 3.

I have already shewn by my illustrations in p. 154, that this position is utterly untenable when compared with the tradition of Diodorus, that the first of Deioces was in 17 Ol. 2. The confirmation of Diodorus by Dr. Hincks' calculation of the eclipse which terminated the Lydian war, has been very striking. I will now add its confirmation by Mr. Airy's calculation of the eclipse at Larissa. This, according to Mr. Airy, was in May, B.C. 557, *i. e.*, 55 Ol. 4. This, according to the canon of Ptolemy, must have been nineteen years before the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. See *Fig. II.* But, according to Diodorus and Eusebius, it was four or five years after his conquest of the Medes, and, according to Africanus and Eusebius, it was three years after his conquest of Babylon and release of the Jews. Cyril (*cont. Julian*, i., p. 13) says, "Haggai and Zacharias prophesied in the fifty-sixth Olympiad, when Cyrus was following up the Persian forces." This was in B.C. 556, a year after the Larissa eclipse. Xenophon (*Anabasis*, iii., 4, 8) says, "At the time the Persians were wresting the empire from the Medes, the king of the

Persians besieged Larissa, and could not take it by any means; but a cloud covered the sun, and caused it to disappear until the inhabitants were seized with consternation, and thus it was taken." This clearly represents the progress of Persia as the *universal* kingdom, and your readers must decide whether it is not far more probable that this happened three years after, as my *Chronology* represents it, than that it happened nineteen years before the overthrow of Babylon.

This is a point to which the attention of the chronologist should be particularly directed. The confirmation of it by Strabo's 250 years for the kingdom of Persia, Pliny's fiftieth Olympiad for the first of Cyrus, and Plutarch's sixty-two years, instead of Diodorus's forty-three years for Artaxerxes Mem., is quite inexplicable, except upon the supposition of truth; but, perhaps, the most forcible testimony in support of it, because the least open to suspicion, is the nine additional *archons* of *Demosthenes*.

FRANKE PARKER.

*Luffingcott, Devon, July 29th, 1864.*

#### ETHNOGRAPHY OF EARLY CHALDEA.—No. III.

THE name of Babylon always possesses a peculiar interest. Thither the Jews were led captive for seventy years,—a captivity which entirely changed the whole character of that people,—against it the chief denunciations of the Old Testament prophets were hurled, and with it will ever be associated the Greek fables of Semiramis. These last seem to have been founded on a confusion of the leader of the Casdim dynasty with "Tsammuramat the queen," whom Rim-zallus III. calls "his wife" (*nin-su*). Now an inscription of Khammurabi, written phonetically in the ordinary Semitic Assyrian, and now in the Museum of Paris, records the construction by that king of the *Nahar-Khammurabi* for the people of Babylon and Accad. This canal, still known under the name of *Nahr-Melik*, was by classical authors ascribed to Semiramis, who, we may infer from a fragment of Berosus, headed his fifth (Assyrian) dynasty (cir. B.C. 1270). The mistake of making Semiramis a woman may have arisen, (1) because, according to M. Ménant's translation, Khammurabi states that he gave to a high tower built in the mouth of the canal "the name of the mother that bare" him, and (2) because of the introduction of the later Tsammuramat into the legend. The change of *kh* to *s(h)* must be explained on the same principle as the converse change of *s(h)* to *kh*, as in *Shamash* and *Khons* and *Χουασβηλος*, etc. Khammurabi was evidently the first of his dynasty, as he does not give his father the title of king, and by the side of the above-mentioned inscription of his we have another dedicated to the goddess Ri on a black stone, the language of which is Janban, shewing that Semitic had not yet be-

come the recognized tongue of the country. His Assyrian extraction is confirmed by some copper rings found at Kalwadha, which read, "the palace of Khammurabi the king," the usual Assyrian formula. Moreover, as far as we can gather from the mutilated inscription on the cylinder of Nabonidus, Khammurabi and another king, \* \* \* na-Samas, restored the temple of the Sun (*ei Parra*) at Senkereh seven hundred years before the time of Nabonidus; and a brick from this temple records the restoration by "Khammurabi, the powerful king, king of Babylon, king of the four races," in which it is interesting to observe that the word for "I built," is *banuw*, from the Semitic root בנא. This *banuw* is again found on a brick legend of Tsin-shada, who would therefore seem to have been a monarch of Casdim origin.<sup>a</sup> In the same dynasty we must place Nara'am-Tsin, Merodach-namana, and Merodach-iddin-akhi with his father, Irba-Merodach, and son, Merodach-sapiq-ziri.<sup>b</sup> It is noticeable that these alone of the Janban rulers call themselves kings of "Babylon," with the exception of Burna-buriyas and Im-dhur, a brick legend of which last, found by Sir R. K. Porter at Hymar, differs much from those of other Chaldean monarchs; whence Sir H. Rawlinson conjectures that he belonged to the Arabian dynasty of Berossus, the Canaanites of Kūthāmī. The evidence for the priority of Burna-buriyas to Khammurabi is complete. Nabonidus, in his cylinder, says, "Bit-Parra, which Burna-buriyas, an ancient king, my predecessor, built, . . . but did not finish," and then after some obliterated lines goes on to speak of Khammurabi. Now Burna-buriyas, as we find from a recently-examined tablet in the British Museum,<sup>c</sup> left two sons, the elder of whom, Kara-khar-das, was slain, and the throne usurped by Nazi-bugas. His younger brother, Curi-galtsu, however, aided by Assur-utilā, king of Assyria, succeeded in killing the usurper and recovering his kingdom. This monarch, who styles himself "the obedient (?) servant of Inu (Bel), the powerful king, king of Cingi-Accad and of the four races," restored the Temple of Ulmis, and lived, according to the dynastic tablet, some centuries before Merodach-iddin-akhi, whose date is fixed by Sennacherib 418 years before his conquest of Babylon, *i. e.*, cir. B.C. 1120. The Casdim occupation, then, must have happened previously to this

<sup>a</sup> In my first letter I included Libitti and Ismi-Dagon in this dynasty, deriving their names from לבית and שמי; but as it is absurd to suppose that any king was ever called "Brick-work," so the name of Ismi-Dagon's son, Gungunuv, precludes a Semitic origin. Ismi-Dagon, if indeed this be the true reading, may have been named after some king of Assyria who had married into the Janban royal family, as we learn Assur-utilā did; and there was an Ismi-Dagon *patezi*, or "ruler," of Assyria, the father of Samas-Rim, who built Bit-Khamri and the great temple of Anu and Rim at Assur (Kileh-Shergat), seven hundred and one years before the time of Tiglath Pileser I. (*i. e.*, cir. B.C. 1830). It is noticeable that the same title of *patezi* is assumed by Lig-\* \*, the first Janban monarch of whom we find record, and by Sacat-tur-kā ("the head son of the two gates"), to whom belongs the black granite statue found by Mr. Loftus at Hammām.

<sup>b</sup> See *Athenæum*, August 22nd, 1863.

<sup>c</sup> *Ibid.*

period, as is evidenced by the Semitic name of the king, and by a black stone record of his, relating the appointment of certain officers at Babylon in the first year of his reign.<sup>d</sup>

Babylon was first made the capital of the kingdom by this dynasty, and this will explain the myth of its foundation and adornment by Semiramis, who, as we have seen, was primarily Khammurabi. It had, however, been in existence some time before, and seems to have been built in the age of Burna-buriyas, when it first appears among the royal titles. At all events it was unknown to the earliest princes with whom we are acquainted, but its Janban origin is proved by the manner in which its name is usually written. Not only has it the affix *ci*, but also the name of the god involved in it is Janban. The first component is the ideograph of "gate," in Janban *ka*, and translated by the Semitic *bab*. This is followed by the D. P. of divinity and the syllable *ra*,<sup>e</sup> which together read, in Janban, *dingir* ("a god," compare Basque *jainko*) and were, therefore, replaced by the Semitic *il* (אל). In the same way all the chief cities of Babylonia were given Semitic glosses by the Casdim colonists; e. g., the primitive capital *Mu-uru(c)* ("the moon city"), the modern Mugheir, was designated Huri. This Sir H. Rawlinson formerly attempted to identify with the חור of Genesis,<sup>f</sup> but the history of Abraham necessitates our fixing the latter place in the north, somewhere near Kharran; and, moreover, חור is from the Assyrian root *avar* ("to see"). Sir H. Rawlinson has himself lately pointed out that the true Hebrew equivalent of Huri is חור.

Babylon, then, we must presume, was founded cir. B.C. 1500. Its name, "Gate of the god," was perhaps derived from some temple which originally stood there. The town on the opposite side of the river, which Nebuchadnezzar afterwards joined to Bab-il, was known by the name of Din-Tir(*ci*), and was, perhaps, the most ancient of the two. At any rate, Nabonidus calls (Nahurum-Tsin?),<sup>g</sup> and Pacu-rattuq, who preceded Curi-galtsu, kings of Din-Tir-(*ci*). This may, however, have merely been the substitution of a later mode of

<sup>d</sup> That the later Semitic Babylonian was, however, by no means yet prevalent throughout the country is evidenced by a contract-cylinder, describing the exchange of property by certain private individuals, dated in the reign of "Merodach-iddin-akhi, the head king," and recently brought to the British Museum, which contains a large preponderance of Janban over Semitic words, such as, e. g., *sac-ci* and *gal-lu* (col. I., lines 8, 33).

<sup>e</sup> A syllabary translates *ra* by *rabatuv*, the Hebrew רב. It seems to have formed the superlative in Janban. Thus, Anu- \* \* -Im and Gungunuv call Nin *gal-ra*, "the very great." Curi-galtsu again adds it to the epithet *sicu*, which appears alone on Tsin-dhur-nabi's brick.

<sup>f</sup> The appellation *Casdim* might easily have been applied to any "conquering" Semitic nation, wherever it might be. It may, however, have been a later gloss, when חור had become identified with a Babylonian city during the captivity (cfer. Joseph. *Antiq.*, i. 7, 2, etc.); but it is noticeable that the expression, "Ur of the Casdim," is only found in the Jehovistic portions of Genesis.

<sup>g</sup> Read by Sir H. Rawlinson *Naram-Sin*, who identified him with the *Nara'am-Tsin*, whose name is found on an alabaster vase obtained by the French commissioner. But I very much doubt the accuracy of this reading. The



speaking for the proper titles; and we do not meet with "Din-Tir(cí)" prior to the reign of Irba-Merodach, the father of Merodach-iddin-akhi, who, on a duck-weight found by Mr. Layard, calls himself "king of Din-Tir(cí)." This name also is Janban. A syllabary gives *din* translated by *balatuv*, which in Assyrian signifies "a house" in both senses of the word (see *J. S. L.*, Jan., 1862, p. 413). I do not know the meaning of *tir*; but the whole expression *Din-Tir(cí)* is sometimes replaced by *e-ci*. Now *e* (v), according to the syllabaries, answered to the Semitic *ka'abu* and *kabu'u*. The Hebrew equivalent is not קָ ("to curse,") as Dr. Oppert supposes, but קָב ("hollow"), whence come קָב, κάβος, and קָב. So in the second epigraph of the Black Obelisk we read that Jehu, son of Omri, sent, among other articles of tribute, *kabuate D.P. khurussu*, "cups" or "vases of gold." A very frequent word in the inscriptions is *an-e*, signifying, as we learn from the Persian transcripts, "heaven," though the proper Assyrian nomenclature was *samami* (שָׁמַמִּי), which occurs on Grotefend's barrel cylinder—*ca'accabis samami utsahin*, "like the stars of heaven I enriched." *An-e*, in Janban, would mean "the divine hollow," which at once reminds us of the connection between *cælum* and κοῖλον, *cohūm* (cfer. *Festus*, p. 31) and χάος or κύω. From the signification "vault" of heaven, *an-e* came to be applied to the "dome" of a building, and so Sargon, in the description of his palace, speaks of *isda-su-ina ra'adi tiq an-e*, "its grove in the gallery outside the dome." To return from this digression. *E-ci* would be "the hollow place," and perhaps referred to some reservoir made there at an early period. It is curious that instead of "Babylon" we occasionally find the monogram for "gate" followed by the symbol of duality, as if the two towns on each side of the river, viz., Bab-il and Din-Tir(cí), were the "gates" of something. Perhaps, they denoted "flood-gates," for from the earliest times that part of the country was intersected by a multitude of canals and other works of irrigation, in order to equalize the annual overflow on each bank. Around these flood-gates two towns would naturally spring up, which, under the fostering hand of the Assyrian dynasties, developed into that mighty city known so well to us from the descriptions of sacred and profane writers. It is remarkable that while Nebuchadnezzar calls himself "king of Bab-il," Nergal-sarru-uzur (Neriglissar), and Nabu-nahit<sup>a</sup> (Nabonidus), style themselves kings of "Din-Tir(cí)." It was, at all events, under these princes that Babylon was raised to the zenith of its glory. Nebuchadnezzar continued the

---

second character in Assyrian certainly has the value of *ra'ahmu* ("a guide"); but I think this was an *acquired* value, taken from the similarity of sound in the Janban pronunciation of the word, just as the sign, which had in the ancient language the value of *isip*, was afterwards used by the Assyrians as a monogram for their root *usib* ("to dwell").

<sup>a</sup> *Nahit* or *na'ahdu* is the Semitic equivalent of *im tug*, with which it is sometimes interchanged in the name of Nabonidus. Dr. Hincks has pointed out (*J. S. L.*, Jan., 1862, p. 403) that *tug* in Janban = "habet;" and *im*, replaced in Assyrian by *rim*, has primarily the sense of "exaltation," and hence of "bright-

works begun by his father Nabopolassar, dug canals, lined the banks of the Euphrates with brick, constructed a huge reservoir, built a palace and a fortress, threw bridges across the river, and erected innumerable temples. To him too the Birs-Nimrud owes its origin. This temple, dedicated to the seven spheres, he calls "the treasury (*zigurra*) of Borsippa." It had been begun by "a former king," who "had built it up (*utsakhiru*) forty-two ammas" (seventy-one feet). The completion of it was left to Nebuchadnezzar, who painted each tier according to the colour attributed to its guardian planet, the summit being afterwards vitrified by fire. Before the decipherment of the cuneiform this ruin was supposed to represent the tower of Babel.

The other chief cities of ancient Babylonia, according to Sir H. Rawlinson's identifications, were "the moon-city," Huri, at Mugheir; "the city" (*uru-ci*), Huruq, at Warka; Sepharvaim, the two Sippara, on each side of the river, at Mosaib;<sup>4</sup> "the sun-city" (*Par-uru-ci*, or *Sin-kur-ci*, whence 𐎶𐎵), at Senkereh; Cutha or Tiggaba, the city of Nergal, at Ibrahim; Calneh (Cal-anu) or Nipur, "the city of Bel" (hence Bilua, B'λβη), at Niffer; Ahi at Hit; and Dur-aba at Akkerkuf. Of these Mugheir was the capital when the earliest monarchs of whom we know anything were ruling, but the primeval head-city seems to have been Senkereh, or, as the copies of Berosus have it, Larancha. From it all the neighbouring country was called Shin'ar, and Genesis x. 10 shews its great priority to the other cities there mentioned, these having been all built "in the land of Shin'ar." Babel, indeed, as we have seen, was not founded before the fifteenth century B.C.; but Calneh and Erech were of a very much higher antiquity. And we may, therefore, presume that "the city of the sun" was the first colony of the Janban emigrants, reared long before the dawn of history or even of tradition. Here was the kingdom of Amraphel, who with his three confederates, Tidal, "king of nations" (*i. e.*, the Kiprat-arbat), Chedor-laomer (Kuduri-Lagamir), "king of Elam" or Nummi, and Arioch, king of Assyria, reduced Palestine. That Arioch was an Assyrian prince is nearly certain. Ellasar is undoubtedly a corrupt reading, and its attempted identification with Larsa is impossible. We may feel pretty sure that the name ought to be 𐎶𐎵, as, indeed, the Jerusalem Targum has it. Resen, again (Gen. x. 12), is proved by cuneiform research to be an old mistake introduced by some copyist who had in his mind the town of Resaina, near the sources of the Khabour. We ought to read Tel-Assur ("the mound of Assur,") which appears in the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem. This is the Assur of the inscriptions, the primeval

ness." So *na'ahdu* is applied not only to the reigning monarch, but also to iron and water. The character having the phonetic power of *am* bears also in Assyrian the value of *rem* (𐎶𐎵) in its meaning of "wild bull;" and these two signs are occasionally confounded.

<sup>4</sup> Sippara in cuneiform is written *Zi-par*, *i. e.*, "place of the sun." *Zi* is of constant occurrence on the Janban bricks, and the syllabaries explain it by *garnu* (𐎶𐎵, not 𐎶𐎶, as *am-zi* would suggest).

capital, which, as the spelling shews, had been built by the Turanian aborigines before the days of Semitic ascendancy.<sup>1</sup> It is possible that Iri-amtuq, perhaps pronounced Iri-avvuq, a *patezi* of Assur, bears the same name as *ירא*. The latter, however, more probably contains Semitic elements. At the same time I am somewhat doubtful whether the Shin'ar of Gen. xiv. 1 is to be considered Chaldea, or whether it be not rather the district round Singara and Singaras Mons, between the Chaboras and the Mygdonius (the Khabur and Hermas of the inscriptions). This, at all events, is the Saenhar, whence, according to the papyri, horses, cattle, and a drink called *nekfitaru*, were brought to Egypt. And it must be remembered that the invaders, according to Genesis, descended from the north, penetrated as far as El-paran, and then returned along the western bank of the Jordan. They had reached Dan before Abram and his allies surprised them in a night attack, when laden with spoil. They had most probably, therefore, pursued the same route as did the Assyrian kings afterwards, viz., that leading from Nineveh to Carchemish, the chief city of the Hittites, and turning through Damascus and Hamath to Lebanon and the Mediterranean; and, indeed, the Janban name *Kharran* ("the road") takes us back to a pre-Semitic epoch. Now, had Amraphel governed in Chaldea, it is difficult to understand how he could have been powerful enough to accompany his forces first to Mesopotamia, and then across the desert to Syria and Palestine, and yet at the same time should have been subject to Elam (Gen. xiv. 4, 5). Besides, the dominion of Sinkereh had waned before the second millennium B.C., when we find Lig, \* \* and his son Elgi ruling at Huri. And before the rise of Huri, Gen. x. 10 would imply that Calneh and Erech had been the seats of power, which is supported by the meaning of the native name of Erech, "the city." So that the supremacy of Sinkereh must be placed at a very remote era, which would, of course, be inconsistent with the age of Abraham.

But this is a point which can only be cleared up when the numerous clay tablets, still lying in the cellars of the British Museum, shall have been thoroughly cleaned and examined. Without doubt this will require time, nevertheless, considering the great results gained during the last fifteen years, we may well believe that it will not be long ere we gain as complete a knowledge of the history of Assyria and Babylonia as was possessed by the literati of Essar-Haddon's court.

Bath.

A. SAYCE.

PS.—I find I have unwittingly made a slip of the pen in my last letter. It is not Nebo that is called "the son of Bit-zirra," but the god Ussur or Nin-ip (cfer. Michead's Stone, col. iv., l. i.).

---

<sup>1</sup> The name *A-sur* literally signifies "water-bank," from the Janban *a*, "water" (Assyrian *mie*, מים), and *usar*, "bank" or "border" (Assyrian *sittuv*, שדה).

## NOTE ON ROMANS VIII. 17, 18.

THE words which in these verses are rendered "suffering with," and "sufferings," implying, in their common acceptation, states of affliction, certainly have not in the original that restricted meaning, although, as it would seem, our commentators have always been content so to receive them.

These words are derived from *πάσχω*, to experience—or be subject to, some particular condition; and, as it is allowable, so it seems to be most reasonable, and most in accordance with the immediate context, and, at the same time, not inconsistent with Scriptural truth, that both words should be understood in a larger sense than is usually given to them, and that thus the expression "suffering with," should be taken to mean a state of *communion* with; and that the word which in the eighteenth verse is rendered "sufferings," should be understood to mean the *actual condition* of the person spoken of, but not necessarily a state of pain or affliction.

It is by no means immaterial to a right understanding of this passage to observe, that when the Apostle would describe a state of suffering in the popular meaning of the word, he usually adopts the word *θλίψις*, "tribulation," as in the thirty-fifth verse of this chapter; and that, although he occasionally uses the word *πάθημα* to denote a state of affliction, he sometimes also uses it to describe a condition in which affliction was not present (as in Gal. v. 24, "have crucified the flesh with the *affections*"); and further, that, when he would describe a community of affliction—a partaking of pain and grief (as in 2 Tim. i. 8), he uses another word than *συνπάσχω*—namely, *συνγκακοπαθέω*: certainly a far more appropriate word to designate a fellowship in affliction. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the same condition is represented by the word *συνκακονχέομαι*.

Judged by the context, it seems far more reasonable to believe that St. Paul in the seventeenth verse alluded to a communion with Christ, a fellowship with Him generally, rather than in affliction only. In the preceding passages not one word occurs in which any condition of pain or sorrow is expressed or implied. He speaks of the believers whom he addressed as having the indwelling of the Spirit, as being the sons of God, the children of God, heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ. The whole passage is jubilant, and the notion of lamentation is excluded, unless it is to be found in the seventeenth and eighteenth verses.

But, further; it appears to be hardly consistent with the tenor of Scripture to believe that the Apostle intended to represent the participation of believers in their Lord's sufferings as a condition of their glorification. Scripture, indeed, abundantly teaches that it is by reason of Christ's suffering *for them* that His followers are to be glorified *with Him*; but the same result is never attributed to their suffering *with Him*; nor can it in any sense be said that such a participation, either as regards the conditions of time, or place, or character, or degree, is possible. Truly, "He has borne *our* griefs,

and carried *our* sorrows ;” but the most devoted of His disciples could never partake of, nor even comprehend in the slightest degree, the nature of that mysterious agony which, in the garden, drew from Him the prayer, “ If it be possible, let this cup pass from me ;” and wrung from Him, in His dying moments, the piteous cry, “ My God! my God! Why *hast* thou forsaken me ?”

It may indeed be said, that, in a certain qualified sense, He suffered with us ; but that is quite consistent with the proposition that we do not suffer with Him. When He deigned to take our nature upon Him, He became “ a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief.” Affliction of some kind or other is incident to the human race, and those trials which believers endure, they endure in common with their fellow-men, whether believers or unbelievers. A condition of affliction is not therefore to be regarded (as has sometimes been pretended by those who would fain exalt their own humility), either as peculiar to the Christian profession, or a condition of the believer’s glorification.

Again, St. Paul never assumed, nor could assume, to judge better or other than our Lord Himself of that which constituted the glorification of His followers. The Gospel which he preached was not received of man, but by revelation of *Him*. And what was that teaching? If we consider those passages in St. John’s Gospel in which He Himself described His own mission, and its influence upon His followers, we find no expression implying that it was by reason of any participation in His sorrows that they were to be glorified with Him. It was because they were living branches of the true vine ; because they believed in God ; because the Spirit of God dwelt in them ; because they had been given to Him of His Father. It is true, He reminds them that they will have to suffer hate and persecution for His sake ; but it is not on this ground that He rests their claim to be with Him, and to behold His glory. Their trials and afflictions were to be the consequence of their communion with Him, and not its cause. He does not pray for them, on the ground that they have suffered, or shall suffer with Him, but in those wondrous words, which no one should attempt to paraphrase, He said, “ I pray for them. I pray not for the world, but for them which Thou hast given me ; for they are Thine, and all Mine are Thine, and Thine are Mine, and I am glorified in them.”

But another and conclusive reason that the Apostle did not here mean to describe a state of affliction may be found in the construction of the eighteenth verse. He is there speaking of two conditions, one of which, he says, is so much more excellent than the other, that it is not to be compared with it—*non æquiparanda*—not to be weighed in the same scales. But like is only comparable with like—*similia cum similibus* ; and no intelligent author would think of instituting a comparison between things utterly dissimilar. Suffering, in the sense of affliction, is the very opposite condition to that state of glory of which the Apostle speaks, and therefore is not capable of comparison with it. The comparison which he meant to

institute was one between the Church militant and the Church triumphant; between faith and hope (*not suffering*)—represented at the earnest expectation of the creature—and that glory in which they were to be absorbed and lost hereafter.

This view of the passage seems both to explain, and be explained by, the twentieth verse, and to go far to remove the difficulties which have been felt in that passage—a passage which Professor Moses Stuart has justly described as one of the *loci vexatissimi*. St. Paul says that the conditions of the present time are not worthy to be compared with those of the time to come. But why? The answer follows:—*for*, or *because*, the creature,—the *human* and rational creature, was made subject to frailty or vanity, and so remains. But a condition of frailty or vanity, although an inferior condition, is not a condition of pain and sorrow, nor is it to be looked upon as a condition of *degradation*; for, on the contrary, the Apostle expressly says that it was so *constituted* by Him who subjected it in hope. When this passage is read aright, do we not get a glimpse of a most important truth, one which has hitherto been obscured by the long-enduring dogmas of the scholastic divinity? Do we not learn that a condition of frailty is the designed and normal condition of our race, rather than the result of an action which was but the manifestation of that condition, and that what has been so long taught to the contrary, is both opposed to reason and unwarranted by Scripture? that it is as impossible for the creature to be perfect, as it is for the Creator to be imperfect—that our moral and spiritual existences (like all material existences) are made up of a constant series or system of wants and supplies? We want, in order that *He* may give; and *He* gives because we need. Thus the want and the supply are both of His ordaining, and those relations are established between Him and His creatures which alone are able to ensure their obedience, and consequent happiness—and accomplish those ends which Divine benevolence designed to accomplish in the moral government of the world.

J. W. F.

---

#### EBER AND THE CHILDREN OF EBER.

IN Genesis x. 21, we read in the common version, "Unto Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the brother of Japheth the elder, even to him were children born." It is plain that Shem could be "*the father of all* the children of Eber," his great-grandson, only by a figure of speech. Shem had five sons, Elam, Asshur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram. The third son, Arphaxad, had one son, Salah, or Shelah, and Shelah was the father of Eber. We should expect that the phrase, "all the children (or sons) of Eber," would be literally intended, and if so, it would include the sons of both Joktan and Peleg. The Joktanides are enumerated in Genesis x. 25—30, and comprise Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, Hadoram, Uzal,

Diklah, Obal, Abimael, Sheba, Ophir, Havilah, and Jobab. Curiously enough, the other branch of the children of Eber (that of Peleg) is omitted from this list, but in the next chapter we have it so far as necessary to shew the descent of Abraham, with the omission of the names not involved in that descent. Eber, Peleg, Ren, Serug, Nahor, Terah, and Abraham, are all mentioned, but, of five generations, only the names of five persons are given us; with the general, but vague, intimation, in most cases, that there were other sons and daughters. A comparison of the two lists will shew that at first we have more names of the Joktan branch of the children of Eber than of the Peleg branch, of which Abram sprang. After Abram's time, the contrary is the case. As a matter of fact, therefore, we do not know how many tribes or families had a right to be called "children of Eber." Subsequently the name *Hebrew*, which has the same radical elements as *Eber*, was applied first to Abraham, and then to such of his descendants as were in the line of Jacob. The resemblance of the two words, Eber and Hebrew עִבְרִי and עִבְרִי, and the circumstance that the Hebrews descended from Eber, have led many to think that the phrase, "all the children of Eber," is the same as "Hebrews," and was given by anticipation to them. The only objection I shall urge against this identification is that the Hebrews did not constitute *all* the children of Eber, and were, in fact, but a very small part of them, as any one may see who looks at the list of Joktanides, and thinks of the descendants of Ishmael and Esau, who were equally the children of Eber.

There is an instance in which Eber is generally thought to mean the Hebrew land or nation, and at the same time to confirm the supposition that "all the children of Eber" means the Hebrews. I shall try to shew that this is quite a misconception, and in pointing out the quarter to which I look for an explanation, I shall add one to the names of nations to be looked for in the Bible. The reference is to Numb. xxiv. 24, where Balaam, the Midianite, is concluding his prophecy. In our version, the verse runs thus:—"And ships (shall come) from the coast of Chittim, and shall afflict Asshur, and shall afflict Eber, and he also shall perish for ever." The difficulty of this passage is great, for whether Chittim is Cyprus, or Italy, or the isles of the Mediterranean, it is hard to see how they could reach Asshur or Assyria. The ancient versions differ much. The Vulgate says, "They shall come in trieremes from Italy, and shall conquer the Assyrians, and devastate the Hebrews, and, at last, shall also perish themselves." The LXX. says: "He shall come forth from the Cittians, and they shall afflict the Assyrians, and shall afflict the Hebrews, and shall themselves perish together." The Samaritan is: "He shall take them from the hand of the Chittim; they shall afflict Asshur, and they shall afflict Heber, and also himself, until he perish." The Arabic is: "And they who steal away from the port of Cyprus shall afflict the Musolæans and Hebrews, shall themselves also come to destruction." The Syriac is: "Legions shall go forth from the land of the Chittim, and shall subjugate Asshur, and shall

subjugate the Hebrews, and, at last, they shall themselves perish for ever." The Targum of Onkelos has, "beyond the Euphrates" (מִן־הַנָּהָר) for Eber. The other Targums vary in a more extraordinary manner. For Eber, that of Jonathan has "All the children of Eber," evidently from Gen. x. 21; but that of Jerusalem has, "All the children of (the land) beyond the river."

Leaving all these, only remarking that the Targums all agree in not identifying Eber with the Hebrews, we ask, what does Eber mean? Observe; Eber is associated with Asshur, not only in the expression of the prophet, but in the very thing predicted:—Asshur and Eber will both be afflicted by a common enemy. We cannot identify them, for the same verb is repeated,—*shall afflict* Asshur, and *shall afflict* Eber. We, therefore, conclude that two nations or countries lying near to one another are meant; that, in short, a nation called Eber was known to Balaam. Where was this nation? It is difficult to say, but at that time it may have been in the very region from which Abram the Hebrew or Eberite came; for many of the children of Eber undoubtedly occupied the countries between the Caspian Sea and the Euphrates, that is, to the north of Asshur. Perhaps, 2,000 years after Abraham, we find the name borne by a province and a people to the north-east of Mount Ararat, where the name lingered on down to the times of Greek and Roman writers. Iberia, and the Iberi or Iberians, are mentioned by Strabo, Ptolemy, Plutarch, and others. At one time, the name may have extended much further, but in it I find the *Eber*, which is mentioned by Balaam, along with Asshur, and, like it, probably owing its name to one of those heads of nations who are mentioned in the tenth of Genesis. C.

#### LAMENTATIONS IV. 20 IN THE LATIN VULGATE.

THIS verse is thus translated, "Spiritus oris nostri Christus Dominus captus est in peccatis nostris: Cui diximus, In umbra tua vivemus in Gentibus." The Douay version is, "The breath of our mouth, Christ the Lord, is taken in our sins, to whom we said, Under thy shadow we shall live among the Gentiles." The English version gives us, "The breath of our nostrils, the anointed of the Lord, was taken in their pits, of whom we said," etc. An older version for *pits* reads *nets*, which is not so exact. It is clear that Jerome understood the Messiah-Jehovah to be Christ, and the whole verse to be a prophecy; but it is not easy to see how he could translate "is taken in our sins" the words which so manifestly signify "*in their pits*." The original allusion seems to be to the King of Judah—the Lord's anointed, who was regarded as the appointed protector of the people, but had fallen into the pits of their enemies. The LXX. reads very much as Jerome in the first part, πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν Χριστὸς Κύριος, etc., "The spirit of our face Christ the Lord," or "the anointed Lord," "was taken in their corruptions," etc. Can the version of Jerome here claim the indulgence even of honest error? B.



## THE SIN OF THE ANGELS.—JUDE 6.

It has been of late rather frequently asserted that there is in Jude 6, 7, an implied reference to what is recorded in Gen. vi. 2; and that the writer of the Epistle designed to point to fornication, or unlawful intercourse with women, as being the sin of the angels of whom he speaks, these being identified with "the sons of God" of Genesis. Against this view of Jude 6, 7 the context furnishes, as it appears to me, a very weighty argument. This argument is, however, one which has not been, so far as I know, previously adduced. We have in Jude 7 *three* instances of punishment being inflicted on transgressors, (1) on the unbelieving Israelites, (2) on the angels, (3) on the cities of the plain. We have also mentioned in Jude 8 *three* sins, of which the persons against whom the Epistle was directed are represented as guilty, (1) *σάρκα μαινουνσιν*, "they defile the flesh;" (2) *κυριότητα αθετουσιν*, "they spurn authority;" (3) *δοξας βλασφημουσιν*, "they speak evil of glories." The question may not unnaturally suggest itself, Is there any relation between these three sins and the three instances of transgression mentioned just before? Strong reasons may, I think, be seen for concluding that there is such a relation, and that the three particulars of verse 8 refer back in inverted order to the three classes of transgressors of 5—7. That there is a reference to the *third* of the one series, the cities of the plain; in the *first* of the other *σάρκα μαινουνσιν*, "they defile the flesh," is sufficiently obvious. It may not be quite so clear at first sight that the words *δοξας βλασφημουσιν*, "they speak evil of glories," refer to the sin of the Israelites. But the supposition that there is such a reference may suggest a reason for the use of that remarkable word *δοξας*, "glories." In the desert the presence of Jehovah with his people was manifested in the *δοξα κυρίου*, "the glory of the Lord." The mysterious pillar guided them in their journeying. And as the Israelites murmured against the Lord who brought them out of Egypt, it might be not unnaturally stated that they *spoke evil of the glory* of the Lord. We come now to the second member of each series; and if the view above given is correct, the words *κυριότητα αθετουσιν*, "they spurn authority," must refer to the sin of the angels of verse 6. To exhibit the reference there is no necessity for twisting the word *αρχην* into any unprecedented sense. The parallel may be shewn at once, if we translate, as we may legitimately and naturally, "angels who regarded not the government over them." A similar rendering of the words *αγγελους τους μη τηρησαντας την εαυτων αρχην* has been, I believe, before proposed; and no valid objection can, I think, be brought against the rendering just given. The sin of the angels of Jude 6 is thus insubordination, and not unlawful intercourse with women. The probability that *αρχη* in our passage denotes ruling angels, or the government over angels, may, perhaps, appear the greater if the use of the word in Eph. iii. 10, Rom. viii. 38, and some other passages is taken into account.

An additional argument in favour of the view which I have given

of Jude 5—8, is furnished by the *ὁμοίως* and *καὶ* of verse 8. The *καὶ*, it would seem, must look back to a previous mention of those who had committed such transgressions as the persons against whom the Epistle was directed *also* had committed. The reference of the *καὶ* cannot be merely to verse 7 and the cities of the plain; for, whatever may be thought about the *κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν*, there would certainly not appear to be anything in verse 7 which corresponds to the *δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν*, neither in what is said of the angels is it implied that they "spoke evil of glories." We are compelled to go back to what had been said in verse 5 of the Israelites. But if *δόξας βλασφημοῦσιν* corresponds to the sin of the Israelites, and *σάρκα μαινοῦσιν* to that of the cities of the plain, the conclusion appears inevitable that *κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν* corresponds to the sin of the angels.

But it may be asked, if there is in the word "glories" a reference to the "glory of the Lord," as manifested in the desert, how could it be said of any persons at the time when the Epistle was written that they "spoke evil of glories?" I reply, that the "glory of the Lord" was a supernatural manifestation. It was not improbably closely connected in the view of the Israelites with "the angel of the Lord."<sup>2</sup> And, accordingly, the word "glories" probably refers to supernatural manifestations generally, and to the spiritual world, or at least to higher spiritual beings. In verse 10 it is said, "*What things they know not these men speak evil of.*"

In accordance with what I have said, verse 8 may be thus paraphrased: "Notwithstanding the signal punishment which has been inflicted on those guilty of such sins, these men, dreaming on, regardless of the fate of their predecessors, defile the flesh, like the cities of the plain; spurn authority, like the angels; and speak evil of glories, like the unbelieving Israelites."

I may add that the *τούτοις* of verse 7, like the *τούτοις* of verse 14, and the *οὗτοι* of verses 8, 10, 12, must refer to those against whom the readers of the epistle are warned. It may be reasonably concluded that this mode of expression results from the writer's vivid realization of these transgressors, and of their guilt.

London, August 23rd, 1864.

THOMAS TYLER.

### THE PREPOSITION "ΕΝ."

THE preposition, "ἐν," does not always receive the attention which it ought to receive, or which it demands, from all readers of the Holy Scriptures. The translators themselves of our (for the most part) admirable English Version, have, in very many instances, failed to recognize this little word in the dignified position in which it is placed in the sacred Volume; and to give it its own simple meaning, to which it is entitled.

<sup>2</sup> Compare Kitto's *Cyclop. Bib. Lit.*, art. "Shekinah."

My present object is, then, to call the general reader's attention to the real force of this preposition, "*ἐν*," which perhaps he often fails to appreciate; and to shew that he frequently loses sight of the real sense of important passages in the Word of God, because our translators, instead of regulating their version by one uniform system of translation, have indulged an arbitrary spirit in the meaning which they have been pleased, in many instances, to attach to this little word "*ἐν*."

It is most striking, as it is blessed, to notice the very marked and systematic manner in which it has pleased the Holy Spirit to use this preposition. Time and space will permit me to call the reader's attention to *some* of the passages only, where the preposition "*ἐν*" stands connected with the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit, and with other words also.

It would probably surprise some persons if they were to see catalogued the large number of instances in which the preposition "*ἐν*," as applied to our Lord Jesus Christ and to the Holy Spirit, is used. Need I tell any that, wherever it is used as the preposition before our Lord's name, it declares the great fact of the indissoluble union, *oneness*, between our Lord Jesus Christ and his believing people: their *oneness* with Him in what He *is*, and in what He has *done* and *suffered* for them in the great work of redemption?

Our Lord himself labours, and his apostles after him labour, to impress upon His people that their being *one with him* is not a mere *expression* or an *idea*, but a great *reality*, a great *fact*; and this preposition "*ἐν*" is that which makes the union a *fact*; and it is also, on His people's part, the important link by which they *realize* the fact.

The *personal Christ* is not merely the glorious object for the believer to look at and gaze upon, but to *exist in*, to *walk in*, to *labour and fight in*, to *live upon* day by day, and he does all this by being *in* Christ. "Abide *in* me, and I *in* you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide *in* me. He that abideth *in* me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing. If a man abide not *in* me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered" (John xv. 4—6). "We, being many, are one body *in* Christ" (Rom. xii. 5). "We are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. v. 30). "We are his workmanship, created *in* Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should *walk in* them" (Eph. ii. 10). "I can *do* all things *in* Christ, which *strengtheneth* me" (Philip. iv. 13). "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth *in* me" (John vi. 56). How does the believer eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood? By being *in* Him. Such an one does not eat and drink simply in a *spiritual sense*. It is a *veritable* eating, and a *veritable* drinking, of Christ's body and blood. It is the believer's *spirit* feeding upon *Christ* the bread of life.

Man's spirit needs daily food equally with his body. If the spirit of man is not fed, it will dwindle and die. The *personal Christ* is the food of man's spirit, and it is his being "*in*" Christ that the feeding

process goes on, and man's spirit receives its suitable nutriment: "He that eateth me, even he shall live by me" (John vi. 57). "Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular" (1 Cor. xii. 27). Believers are *limbs* of the *personal Christ*, and, being *in* Him, partake of all that is in Him which is necessary for the *health*, the *growth*, and the perfecting of their spirits for the glory above.

Let us notice, first of all, some of the instances where the preposition "ἐν," the expressive word selected by the Holy Spirit to describe the *oneness* of Christ and his people, is rendered, in its simple and proper meaning, "*in*" by our English translators.

Are *believers* special objects of God's love? It is "*in*" Christ that he loves them (Rom. viii. 39). Has God chosen his people before the foundation of the world to be holy? It is "*in*" Christ that he has made the selection (Eph. i. 4). Are any begotten and born again to a new spiritual life through the Gospel? It is "*in*" Christ that the begetting process has taken place (1 Cor. iv. 15). Is the Christian believer exhorted to "*walk*," to conduct himself in accordance with his Christian profession? It is "*in*" Christ that this active life of his spirit, of his mind, and of his body, must be carried on (Col. ii. 6). Is he exhorted to be *strong*? It is "*in*" Christ that real and available strength can be experienced and exhibited (Eph. vi. 10). Is it possible for sinful man to be placed in such a position as to be wholly free from all condemnation? the condemnation of God's broken law? the condemnation of sin? the condemnation of men and devils? Yes! And what is that position? Simply his being "*in*" Christ (Rom. viii. 1). Would he possess a righteousness (even the righteousness of God) which will ever render him acceptable in God's sight, now in his time state, and in eternity? It is "*in*" Christ that *that* righteousness can be obtained (2 Cor. v. 21). Would the Christian believer be perfect without spot of sin, the least sin? It is "*in*" Christ that *that* sinless perfection can be attained (Col. i. 28; ii. 10). When such an one dies, would he die in peace with an assured hope of a glorious immortality? He must die "*in*" the Lord (1 Thess. iv. 13; Rev. xiv. 13). Would he belong to that blessed company who shall be the first to rise from the dead? Then he must be "*in*" Christ, for the dead "*in*" Christ shall rise first (1 Thess. iv. 16). Would the apostle Paul describe himself in connection with that mysterious and ecstatic state into which he found himself suddenly introduced when he was caught up into the third heaven, even into Paradise? He describes himself in this simple, yet most significant manner, "a man *in* Christ" (2 Cor. xii. 2). When the same apostle exhorts the Christians at Rome to receive a spiritual sister, he exhorts them to do so "*in*" the Lord (Rom. xvi. 2). Does he speak of some who had greatly aided him in the cause of the Gospel? He speaks of them as his helpers "*in*" Christ (verse 3). Does he send a salutation to Christian *brethren* who had been converted to the Christian faith long before he was converted to it himself? He describes them as having been "*in*" Christ before him (Rom. xvi. 7). Does he send a greeting to a par-

ticular Christian whom he especially loved? He speaks of such an one as *beloved* "in" the Lord (verse 8). Does he single out again other eminent Christians who had zealously and unceasingly occupied themselves in the cause of the Gospel? He speaks of two of them as those who labour "in" the Lord; and of a third as one who laboured much "in" the Lord (verse 12). Does Paul exhort children to be obedient to their parents? In his exhortation he enforces the great truth, that it is "in" Christ that children can render that reverence and obedience to them which God will be pleased with (Eph. vi. 1). And once more would we ourselves, as Christians, have grace given to us? It is "in" the beloved that grace can be conferred and received (Eph. i. 6).

In these, and in various other Scriptures which might be referred to, the important preposition "ἐν" has its *real, simple, and natural* sense, "in," given to it; and it carries with it its deep and pregnant meaning. The general reader cannot fail, in these and in other instances, where it is so rendered by our translators, to catch the meaning and to realize the fact. In proportion as such an one is taught of the Holy Spirit, in that same proportion will he be enabled to see the full force of the original in our vernacular Version.

But then the question arises, Why did the translators of our English Bible deviate from this rule of giving the preposition "ἐν" its simple meaning? and by so doing, in many instances, mislead the general reader, and prevent his gathering the real sense of the passage?

Many who have never turned their attention to this point would hardly credit the many instances in which the preposition "ἐν," of the original Greek, is translated in our Authorized Version into "by," "through," "with," "at," etc., etc. And not only does the word so rendered prevent the general reader's noticing the beautiful and systematic manner in which it has pleased the Holy Spirit to present the rich truth of the Gospel, as embodied in the term "in Christ," to the believer's mind; but it has led many to take quite a wrong view of the passages altogether, and to attach a meaning to them which they do not bear. I trust it will not be considered tedious my giving instances of various passages from the Word of God, wherein the little preposition "ἐν," both in reference to our Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit, is rendered "by," "through," "with," "at," instead of "in," its *simple, forcible, and most significative* meaning, as used in the New Testament.

These prepositions will, I think, more or less, convey to the general reader's mind the idea of *separateness* from the object to which they are attached, rather than the most close and intimate *union, oneness*, which the word "ἐν" is clearly intended to express.

Phil. iv. 13, "I can do all things 'through' Christ, which strengtheneth me." It is "in" Christ, and the power of action which the apostle experienced and used was *Christ's* power, which became the *apostle's* power through his being a *part* of Christ. Again, Acts iv. 10, "By" the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth; even "by" Him

doth this man stand here before you whole. It is "*in*" the name, and "*in*" this man (*ἐν τούτῳ*) doth this man stand here before you whole. I need scarcely remark that "*name*" is synonymous with "*person*;" as in the following instances:—

John i. 12; iii. 18; xx. 31; etc. The worker of the miracle wrought it *not* by a power *imparted* to him by Christ, but by *Christ's* own power, which the former was enabled to use through his being "*IN*" Christ in union with Christ.

Acts xiii. 39, "And *by* him all that believe are justified from all things." It is "*in*" Him, Jesus Christ. The believer is justified "*in*" Him because Christ, the *personal Christ*, of whose body he is a member, is the believer's righteousness and redemption.

Phil. ii. 10, "At the name of Jesus every knee should bow," etc. It is "*in*" the name of Jesus, etc. Not to mention the very singular error into which some persons have fallen touching the meaning of this Scripture, such as *bowing the head* when the name of Jesus is mentioned, many, even commentators, evidently biassed by the English preposition "*at*" for "*ἐν*," have failed in giving the correct and most forcible interpretation of this passage of the Word of God. For instance, Thomas Scott makes the following remarks in explanation of this Scripture:—

"'At the name of Jesus,' the name given to a poor babe born in a stable and laid in the manger (because that babe was Emmanuel, 'God with us,' that child born, that Son given, was the mighty God) every knee should bow in *submission* and *adoration*. That is, all rational creatures should either willingly *adore* him, or be punished as the enemies of God and His kingdom."

Matthew Henry again, in his note upon this passage, expresses himself in the following manner: "The whole creation *must be in subjection to Him*: things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; the inhabitants of heaven and earth, the living and the dead. At the name of Jesus, not at the sound of the word, but the authority of Jesus, *all should pay a solemn homage*."

I do not deny that what is stated by these excellent commentators, and others, *may* be involved in these words; but this passage of Scripture, viewed in its simple and natural sense, "that *in* the name of Jesus every knee shall bow," (the *name* being synonymous with the *person*,) declares this glorious fact, that all adoration, all praise, all worship, offered up to God, must be offered up "*in Christ*" to render it acceptable: that union with Christ, being *in Christ*, a member of His mystical body, is a *necessary qualification* on the part of any penitent sinner's being accepted of God himself; or any homage, any act of worship of his, being accepted also.

Col. i. 16, 17, "*By* Him were all things created that are in heaven, etc.; and *by* Him all things consist." The Greek is, "*in* Him"—*ἐν αὐτῷ, ἐν αὐτῷ*. First; we must observe here that our translators, in translating, as they have done, the first *ἐν*, "*by*," have occasioned a tautology in verse 16 which does not exist in the original.

In the last clause of verse 16, "all things were created *by Him*;" it is, δι' αὐτοῦ. A short portion of Dean Alford's note on this passage of Scripture I transcribe, as it gives a most satisfactory interpretation of it. "*In Him*," (as the conditional element pre-existent, and all including,) not "*by Him*," as the English version, after Chrysostom—τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ, δι' αὐτοῦ, ἐστίν; this is expressed afterwards, and is a different fact from the present one, though implied in it.

Rom. v. 10. "We shall be saved *by His life*." It is, "saved *in His life*." Surely the former preposition, "*by*," fails to convey the real meaning which is involved in this Scripture. Thomas Scott, in his note upon this passage, comments upon it thus: "If, etc., etc., they had been brought into a state of reconciliation and cordial peace with Him, by the death of His Son upon the cross, 'much more' would they, being thus reconciled, *be preserved from falling under the power of sin and Satan, or finally apostatizing, by His life, His intercession, authority, and omnipotent grace.*"

Robert Haldane again, in his comment upon this Scripture, observes: "'Saved *by His life*;' the apostle is speaking of the security of the believer from any danger, by Christ, as alive. The meaning is, we shall be saved by Him, as existing alive, or as living (Heb. vii. 25). We need Christ raised from the dead to *intercede for our daily transgressions*, and to *save us from wrath*. The efficacy of the death and the *intercession* of Jesus Christ, have the same objects and the same extent (John xvii. 9). He intercedes for all those for whom He died." "Since the death of the Redeemer could produce so great an effect as the reconciliation to Himself of those who were enemies of the Most High, what room can there be to doubt that *the life of Christ is sufficient to accomplish what is less difficult, that is to say, to obtain the continuation of the divine friendship and benevolence for those whose reconciliation has been already purchased at a price of such infinite cost?*"

Great and blessed truths are here declared by these excellent commentators; but, surely, they neither of them give the correct interpretation of this Scripture. "Saved *in His life*." What is salvation? It is *life* in the highest sense of this significative and glorious word. If man is saved, man's spirit *lives* again. It is *sin* which has put to death man's spirit. *Death* from man's spirit has been removed by Jesus Christ's *death*. The true believer's spirit is now *saved*, because it *lives* again: *life is salvation*. And what is the true believer's *life*? Christ! Christ's life. "Christ who is our life." (Col. iii. 4.) "God hath given to us eternal *life*, and this *life* is *in* his Son. He that hath the *Son*, hath *life*." (1 John v. 11, 12.) The true believer is saved, not simply because Jesus Christ has *died* for him, nor because he has risen again; both these great works were absolutely necessary for man's salvation, and man could never have been saved unless they had both been accomplished; but the believer is actually saved *in Christ's life*, because the believer, being a member of Christ's mystical body, *Christ's life* is the *believer's life*, in consequence

of his being a member of Christ's body, and the believer *lives in Christ's life*. It is not merely that Jesus Christ has *purchased* life for the believer, nor that He *sustains* life in him, after that it has been given; but Jesus Christ's *own veritable life* is the *believer's life*, and he is "*saved in His life*." And what is more: as the believer's life is not a *distinct life* of his *own*, but the life of *another*, even *Jesus Christ's life*, he can never lose *that* life as Adam lost *his* life. It is secured to him *in* Christ, and as *Christ lives*, so *he* must live for ever and ever.

But I am exceeding proper limits in making these comments. I must now only refer the general reader to a few other passages in the New Testament, where the word "ἐν," is translated "*by*," or "*through*," and thus the important theological meaning which that preposition carries with it is lost sight of. "Justified *by* Christ." (Gal. ii. 17.) "Unto Him be glory in the church, *by* Christ Jesus." (Eph. iii. 21.) "The grace of God, which is given *by* Jesus Christ, that in everything ye are enriched *by* Him." (1 Cor. i. 4, 5.) "Justified *by* his blood." (Rom. v. 9.) "Enter into the holiest *by* the blood of Jesus." (Heb. x. 19.) "Thou hast redeemed us to God *by* thy blood." (Rev. v. 9.) "Called us to eternal glory *by* Christ Jesus." (1 Pet. v. 10.) "Taught *by* Him." (Eph. iv. 21.) THROUGH.—"Blessing of Abraham came on the Gentiles *through* Jesus Christ." (Gal. iii. 14.) "Eternal life *through* Jesus Christ our Lord." (Rom. vi. 23.) "Alive unto God *through* Jesus Christ our Lord." (vi. 11.)

It is "ἐν" (*in*) in every one of these passages, where it is translated "*by*," and "*through*," and whilst I forbear quoting more, I cannot resist, before I bring these remarks to a close, selecting a few of the many passages of Scripture, where the little but all important preposition "ἐν" (*in*), as joined to the HOLY SPIRIT, is also rendered by the translators of the Authorized Version "*by*" and "*through*." I shall not comment upon them, but leave the reader himself to see what preciousness is bound up in the word "*in*," in connection with the *Holy Spirit*.

In each of the following passages, where the preposition "*by*," or "*whereby*," or "*through*," is used, it is in the Greek "ἐν," (*in*). "*By* one Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) "The Holy Spirit of God *whereby* (Greek, "*in whom*") ye are sealed," etc. (Eph. iv. 30.) "Access *by* one Spirit," etc. (Eph. ii. 18.) "Faith *by* the same Spirit." (1 Cor. xii. 9.) "An habitation of God *through* the Spirit." (Eph. ii. 22.) "Chosen you to salvation *through* sanctification of the Spirit." (2 Thess. ii. 13.) "Speaking *by* the Spirit of God." (1 Cor. xii. 3.)

And it is not only when joined to Jesus Christ, and to the Holy Spirit, that in the Authorized Version the preposition "ἐν" (*in*) is variously translated; but in other instances also, where it stands connected with other words, it is rendered "*by*," "*through*," "*with*," "*for*," "*to*," and "*into*." "*Through* (ἐν) the righteousness of God," etc. (2 Pet. i. 1.) "Justified *by* (ἐν) the law," etc. (Acts xiii. 39.) "Gift *by* grace." (Roman v. 15.) "Let your speech be always *with* grace." (Col. iv. 6.) "Good hope *through* grace." (2 Thess. ii. 16.)



"Girt about *with* (ἐν) truth." (Eph. vi. 14.) "With (ἐν) the preparation of the Gospel of grace." (vi. 15.) "Live *by* (ἐν) the faith of the Son of God." (Gal. ii. 20.) "Spake in time past unto the Father *by* (ἐν) the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us *by* (ἐν) His Son." (Heb. i. 1, 2.) "Heaped treasure together *for* (ἐν) the last days." (James v. 3.) "Add *to* (ἐν) your faith virtue, and *to* (ἐν) virtue knowledge; and *to* (ἐν) knowledge, temperance; and *to* (ἐν) temperance, patience; and *to* (ἐν) patience, godliness; and *to* (ἐν) godliness, brotherly kindness; and *to* (ἐν) brotherly kindness, charity." (2 Pet. i. 5—7.) "Lord, remember me when thou comest *into* (ἐν) thy kingdom." (Luke xxiii. 42.)

This *variable* rendering of the preposition "ἐν" is certainly strange; and the simple and unbiassed reader of the Greek Testament, even though he may make no profession of GREEK scholarship, cannot fail to be struck with such a changeable rendering of a word which, when taken in its plain and simple sense, is taken in its proper sense; and, being so taken, in many passages of Scripture conveys a meaning which is *deep*, and *rich*, and *soul-satisfying*, to the contemplative mind.

I am aware how very meagre and imperfect these observations are; and if the man of learning and profound criticism should chance to glance his eye over this paper, and estimate it at a low rate, I would ask such an one to take up the subject himself (for it is an important one), and, with a master mind, to fathom its depths, and, with lucid language, to describe its glories.

A preposition so systematically employed by the Holy Ghost, and standing connected, as it does, with Jesus Christ and with the Holy and Eternal Spirit, and used to declare the intimate and mysterious union which exists between the penitent believer and Deity, which make such an one a partaker of the Divine nature (2 Peter i. 4), grafts him into Christ, and gives him the assurance that he moves about as a *member* of Christ's body, that he *acts*, and *thinks*, and *speaks*, and *lives*, not simply as one whom the Beloved gives grace *to*, to carry out these duties, but that he *acts*, *thinks*, *speaks*, and *lives*, as "*in*" the *Beloved himself*: such a *preposition* as this, claims the attention of the most profound critics, and the most spiritually-minded scholars, in order that persons so eminently qualified may describe the fulness of meaning which it bears, for the edification of less gifted persons: and it claims the attention also of the humblest reader of God's Word, whose duty it is to spell out something of its deep and mysterious import for himself. In the contemplation of what is involved in the preposition "ἐν," in its *simple* sense and in its *deep meaning*, how much is there to engage the thought, to elevate the mind, and to absorb the whole inner man of the true believer. It opens before him a vast expanse of glory, which man's spirit may constantly gaze upon with rapture, but the limits of which it will never reach. Its *immensity* of meaning, as it is so often set before us in the New Testament, forms one great feature of its preciousness. We reflect, and reflect upon it again and again, and it ever opens before us fresh glories, which will be seen in all their per-

fection only in the world above. But the glimpses we get of them here cheer and comfort us in our pilgrimage state; and we do well in attempting (feeble though our attempt may be) to draw others' attention to them, that they may be cheered and comforted also.

W. R. COXWELL ROGERS.

*Dowdeswell Rectory, Gloucestershire, July 4th, 1864.*

### EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES OF MANETHO.

ALLOW me to offer a few remarks in reply to Dr. Hincks' paper on the "Egyptian Dynasties of Manetho," which appeared in the *Journal* of last January, and in which he has called in question my arrangement of the reigns of the kings of the twenty-fifth dynasty, in connection with the conquest of Egypt by Cambyzes. Dr. Hincks has there and elsewhere proclaimed himself the champion of the commonly received chronology of those times, as arranged by Ussher and the many eminent chronologists who have followed him, and supports his cause with great learning and ability: while, on the other hand, I have contended, and still contend, that Ussher's reckoning throughout the times of the Jewish monarchy is in error to the extent of between twenty and thirty years. I have been lately occupied in preparing for publication in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* a paper shewing how the Assyrian canon of Sir Henry Rawlinson proves, beyond question, that the Hebrew reckoning of Ussher, in the times of Tiglath-pileser, Sargon, and Sennacherib, is in excess to the extent of twenty-three or twenty-four years, and how Dr. Hincks, in his endeavour to escape from the evidence of this invaluable record, is compelled, as it were in despair, to suggest that four Assyrian scribes, who have each given independent copies of the canon (one of them writing in the reign of Sennacherib), have ignorantly omitted about thirty names from the list of Assyrian archons, which, if inserted, would produce harmony between his reckoning and that of the canon. Few, it may be assumed, will be disposed to acquiesce in such a mode of treating the adverse evidence of an ancient document: and Sir Henry Rawlinson denies that there is the slightest foundation for this assumption. The presumption is, that if, according to the Assyrian canon, Ussher's reckoning is in excess twenty-three or twenty-four years in the days of Ahaz and Hezekiah, the contemporaries of Sargon and Sennacherib, his reckoning must also be in error to the same extent in the reign of Jehoiakim, the contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar. I have therefore endeavoured to shew that the battle of Carchemish, which was fought in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, and in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the army of Necho II., king of Egypt, was destroyed, was fought, not in the year B.C. 604, as Dr. Hincks and most other chronologists suppose, but in the year B.C. 583, soon after the eclipse of Thales, which governs the date of

the event, and in accordance with the reckoning of Demetrius, who places the accession of Nebuchadnezzar at that time; and this I have made the fundamental date of my whole system.<sup>1</sup> But if Necho II. was alive till the year B.C. 583, then, according to the proposed reckoning, would Psammuthus, the successor of Necho, appear to have reigned five years, till the year 578; Apries, or Pharoah Hophra, to have reigned nineteen years, till 559; and Amasis, the successor of Apries, who was conquered by Cambyses, or at any rate succeeded by him, to have reigned forty-four years, till the year B.C. 515, that is to say, till ten years after the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses. Now Dr. Hincks, with his usual acuteness, fixes upon this result as untenable; and I am willing to confess that he has exposed the weak point in my arrangement, and that it must be abandoned.

I have already pointed how much Herodotus and Ctesias differ in their accounts of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses—how Manetho, the Egyptian priest, was the fittest person to decide between the two historians on Egyptian matters—and how Manetho, who complains much of the errors of Herodotus, has decided in favour of Ctesias, by assigning six years instead of three to the reign of Cambyses in Egypt, which accords also with the reckoning of the Parian chronicle. I have also observed that the Apis buried in the fourth of Cambyses, and the Apis born in the fifth of Cambyses, were buried and born, not in the fourth and fifth years of his reign at Babylon, but in the years so counted from his conquest of Egypt. To all this I still firmly adhere. But, having appealed to Manetho as the fittest referee on Egyptian matters, I am bound by his decision in favour of Herodotus as regards the reign of Amasis. Now Manetho, as copied by Africanus, certainly assigns forty-four years to the reign of Amasis, and six months to Psammecherites, before the conquest of Cambyses. So that if Egypt were conquered in B.C. 325, upon which all are agreed, Amasis must have begun to reign in the year B.C. 569: and this is the date of his first year, according to Dr. Hincks.

Having thus, in deference to Dr. Hincks, pleaded guilty to an error in my own scheme, and corrected it, I proceed to point out the weak point in the scheme of Dr. Hincks. No one is better aware than Dr. Hincks that his date, B.C. 594, for the death of Necho II. is untenable, if the Astronomer Royal has proved that the eclipse of Thales should be placed, as it was placed in ancient days, in the year B.C. 585. This result of modern astronomical science is, after fifteen years' discussion, now generally admitted. Dr. Hincks, however, is still unconvinced, and loudly demands that Hansen's Lunar and Solar Tables, which confirm Mr. Airy's calculations, should be tested by certain lunar eclipses of ancient days, the times of which have been recorded: while Mr. Airy, who has tested his reckoning by recorded total eclipses of the sun, replies that every solar eclipse is at least fifty times as valuable as any lunar eclipse; and every total eclipse of the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Transactions of the Chronological Institute*, vol. ii., part iii., p. 16.

sun is at least ten times as valuable as any other eclipse of the sun, as a test of these tables : and that to put the calculations to the test of lunar eclipses, would be much like testing the scales of the Bank of England by some coalheavers' machine. This, then, is the weak point of Dr. Hincks' arrangement ; and, until he shall have succeeded in setting aside the calculations of modern astronomy, which are in unison with the records of ancient history, we may safely place the termination of Necho's reign not earlier than B.C. 583.

But if Necho ceased to reign in B.C. 583, then, as before observed, Apries must have completed his nineteenth year in B.C. 559 ; so that, if Dr. Hincks is right as regards the reign of Amasis, and I am right as regards the reign of Necho, Amasis, whose first year we have fixed in B.C. 569, must have begun to reign eleven years before the death of Apries. Now this result, at first sight, appears to be highly improbable. But if we examine the history of the two kings, as related by Herodotus, and the records of the Apis tombs, and also the reckoning of the reign of Manetho, we shall find strong, if not decisive, reasons for inferring that such was the actual arrangement of those two reigns. In the first place, we are informed by Herodotus that, after the battle between Apries and Amasis, which decided the fate of the former, Apries "fell into the hands of his enemies, and was brought back a prisoner to Sais, where he was lodged in what had been his own house, but was *now the palace of Amasis*. Amasis treated him with kindness, and kept him in the palace for awhile."<sup>m</sup> There, then, is direct evidence that Amasis came to the throne before the death of Apries, though for how long a time is not stated.

Secondly ; Africanus, in copying from Manetho, cuts out ten years between the first year of Necho and the first of Amasis. He deducts, however, from the reign of Necho, the years which we propose to deduct from the reign of Apries.

Thirdly ; Herodotus relates that the cause of the invasion of Egypt by Cambyses was, that Amasis had sent the daughter of Apries, as a wife, to Cambyses, instead of his own daughter. Now, if Apries had died forty years before this marriage, his daughter must have been between forty and fifty years of age at the time, which makes the story highly improbable. But, if Amasis began to reign eleven years before the death of Apries, his daughter may, in that case, have been not more than thirty years of age when sent to Cambyses, which is quite within range of probability. But what appears to render it almost certain that Amasis came to the throne exactly eleven years before the death of Apries, is the testimony of the Apis tablets. M. Mariette has discovered a series of tombs of the sacred bulls buried at Memphis, through the successive reigns of Psammetichus, Necho, Psammuthis, Apries, Amasis, Cambyses, and Darius, each successive Apis being there recorded to have been born, or installed, within one or two years, at most, after his predecessor's death, with one single exception, con-

<sup>m</sup> Rawlinson's *Herod.*, ii., 169.

nected with the reigns of Apries and Amasis. An Apis is recorded to have died in the twelfth year of Apries, that is to say, in the year B.C. 566, according to our reckoning, and the birth of the next Apis is found not to have taken place till the fifth year of Amasis, that is to say, not till twelve years after the death of his predecessor, according to the reckoning of Dr. Hincks, but in the year following his death, B.C. 565, according to the arrangement proposed. Dr. Hincks has not overlooked this remarkable fact. He assumes that Apries must have reigned, not nineteen years, as Manetho records, but twenty-five years, as Herodotus affirms, and observes: "In connection with this supposed interval, it has occurred to me that an Apis must have died of whom no record is preserved. It is highly improbable that there should be no Apis for eleven years and a half; but if an Apis died in the latter end of N. 182 (that is, in the supposed twenty-second year of Apries), and was buried by Apries, with dates recorded on the stèles, in the years of his reign, the birth in his twelfth or thirteenth year, and the death in his twenty-third year, it seems to me highly probable that Amasis would destroy these records."<sup>\*</sup> Here, again, is another weak link in Dr. Hincks' armour. Why should Amasis destroy the tomb of the Apis, which died in the twenty-third year of Apries, rather than the Apis which died in his twelfth year? and why should he destroy either one or the other? It is clearly improbable that an interval of eleven years and a half occurred before the birth of the successor of the Apis who died in the twelfth year; and, considering that Amasis began to reign while Apries was still living in his palace, the natural inference is, that the fifth year of Amasis, when Apis was born, was counted from the time of his taking possession of that palace, and was concurrent with the thirteenth year of Apries. Such is a simple solution of the difficulty pointed out by Dr. Hincks in my former arrangement of these reigns, which has hitherto caused me much perplexity; and, according to this arrangement, the Psammetichus who was born in the third year of Necho II., and lived seventy-one years and upwards, till the thirty-fifth year of Amasis, must have died in February B.C. 524, in the course of the first year of Cambyses in Egypt, which was reckoned as the thirty-fifth of Amasis by the writer of the epitaph, Amasis being still in bondage in Persia, according to the testimony of Ctesias.

I agree with Dr. Hincks that the Parian chronicle places the end of the reign of Darius in the year B.C. 486, not in 489, thus giving thirty-one years to the reign of that king, and thus also confirming the testimony of Ctesias, to the rejection of that of Herodotus, as Manetho has also done. But when he asserts that the Apis born in the May, in the fifth year of Cambyses, was that which was stabbed by Cambyses on his return from his expedition against Ethiopia, the evidence is against him. For the Apis which was stabbed, after lingering for a time, died; whereas the Apis born in the fifth year lived till the fourth

---

<sup>\*</sup> *J. S. L.*, Jan., 1864, p. 450.

year of Darius. Apis must have been stabbed, therefore, between September, in the fourth year, when the preceding Apis died, and May, in the fifth year, when his successor was born. Considering, also, that he lingered before his death, we cannot date the blow later than the beginning of the fifth, or end of the fourth year of Cambyses. And since it is highly improbable that this conquest and settlement of Egypt by Cambyses, the arrival of an embassy in Ethiopia and its return, and the return of the expedition against Ethiopia to Memphis, when Apis was struck by the king, should all have taken place within six or seven months between the end of August, B.C. 526, and February or March, 525, in the course of the first half of the third year of the 63rd Olympiad, as Dr. Hincks supposes, and in the fourth year of Cambyses, counted from the death of Cyrus, it appears pretty clear that the fourth and fifth years of Cambyses, recorded on the Apis monuments, are not the fourth and fifth counted from Cyrus, but the fourth and fifth years of his reign counted from the conquest of Egypt; in confirmation of which, Manetho expressly declares that the invasion of Egypt did not take place till the fifth year of the reign of Cambyses over the Persians. Dr. Hincks lays much stress on the fact that Herodotus lived nearer to the reign of Cambyses than Ctesias, and that he was, therefore, more likely to have collected the truth than the latter. Without admitting the full weight which is attached to the argument by Dr. Hincks, he will readily admit that Æschylus, who lived still nearer to the time of Cambyses than Herodotus, should, by the same reasoning, be treated as a still higher authority. Now, if we refer to Æschylus, we find that he places two kings, viz., Meraphis and Artaphernes, between the reigns of Smerdis, or Mardos, and Darius. Æschylus, therefore, supports the arrangements of Ctesias rather than that of Herodotus, and is in harmony also with the Parian chronicle and Manetho. There is much reason, therefore, to convict Herodotus of inaccuracy in his statement, even if Manetho had not passed adverse judgment against him in Egyptian matters, as Josephus, who had seen the work of Manetho, affirms.

J. W. BOSANQUET.

*Claymore, August, 1864.*

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Lao Tseu Tao-te-King ; le livre de la voie et de la vertu, composé dans la 6e siècle avant l'ère Chrétienne, par le philosophe Lao-Tseu. Traduit en Français, et publié avec le texte Chinois et un commentaire perpétuel.* Par STANISLAS JULIEN, Membre de l'Institut, et Professeur au Collège de France. Un vol. 8vo. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.

THE history of ancient philosophy has, within the last twenty or thirty years, received considerable additions; its domains now extend over a far wider field than before, and the time is not far distant when the speculations of Hindoo and Chinese sages will be as familiar to the general student as are, at present, the theories of Aristotle, Plato, and Plotinus. Amongst the works treating of metaphysical lore in connection with regions belonging to the far East, we would assign a very high place to M. Stanislas Julien's translation of the *Tao-te-King*; and, accordingly, we purpose examining it here somewhat in detail. It is only fair to state, at the outset, that we labour under the disadvantage of not being able to read the original, from which M. Julien has worked; but, all persons who take any interest in questions referring to linguistics are aware of the strict accuracy of that gentleman's translations; and, besides, our design is to deal with points, not of grammar or of style, but of doctrine.

M. Meadows, in his excellent chapters on the philosophy of the Chinese,<sup>a</sup> has the following remarks:—"The Chinese have acquired, in the course of their existence, more than one kind of philosophy, that is to say, there existed in China several radically different ways of viewing the nature of the inanimate world and of man. The principal of these are the Taouist, the Buddhist, and what may, in order to distinguish it from the others, be called the Confucian. The Taouist is, like the Confucian, indigenous. Lao-Tsze, the founder of Taouism, lived in the sixth century before Christ. Buddhism penetrated into China from India in the first century after Christ. There was a long struggle for the mastery amongst the adherents of these three systems, a struggle which expressed itself in mutual proscriptions and persecutions. But the Confucian, which existed in China long before the others, has, since this rise, always succeeded in maintaining for itself the greatest ascendancy, except during some comparatively short periods, and it became definitively paramount fully ten centuries ago. . . The cause of the prevalence of Taouism, Buddhism, and Mahomedanism in China, in spite of discouragements, lies in the fact that Confucianism says little or nothing of a supernatural world or of a future existence. Hence it

<sup>a</sup> *The Chinese and their Rebellions*, chap. xviii., p. 326, ffwg.

leaves almost unsatisfied those ineradicable cravings of human nature—the desire to revere, and the longing for immortal life.” In this quotation, we find a succinct enumeration of the chief systems that have obtained amongst the Chinese: Taoism is the one with which we have to deal on the present occasion, and we shall see how Lao-Tsze and his disciples attempted to solve those weighty problems altogether left unnoticed by Confucius. It is a singular fact that, if we believe M. Meadows, “all cultivated Chinese are—intellectually, at least—strict and conscientious atheists.”<sup>b</sup> But the history of that nation is another proof of the truth that no system of philosophy, based upon the denial of the existence of God, can be thoroughly carried out. M. Auguste Comte himself was obliged to acknowledge this virtually in the last stage of his metaphysical career; and so it is with the Chinese. “Theoretically,” says M. Meadows, “they are atheists; practically, they are pantheists, or even theists.”

We come now to the Tao-te-King itself. We may describe it as the collection of the thoughts of a mystic philosopher on life and on virtue. The author, Lao-Tsze, was born, according to the most authentic records, in the year 604 B.C., being the third year of the reign of the emperor Tching-wang, of the Tcheou dynasty. He appears to have occupied, at first, some office under government, but he soon yielded to his natural taste for study and retirement, and, seeing political affairs going from bad to worse, on account of the corruption of those in authority, he gave up his public duties. Lao-Tsze is the first of a series of ten philosophers, whose names M. Stanislas Julien quotes in his Preface, and the latest of whom flourished between 32 and 7 B.C. Some idea can be formed of the difficulties of every kind which the Tao-te-King presents when we refer to the acknowledgment made by M. Abel Rémusat, who, some years ago, wrote an essay on the life and works of Lao-Tsze, in the course of which he translated various extracts from the *Tao-te-King*: “Le livre de Lao-Tseu,” said he, “n’est pas facile à entendre, parceque l’obscurité des matières s’y joint à une sorte de concision antique—à un vague qui va quelquefois jusqu’à rendre son style énigmatique. . . Ce serait une difficulté très-grande s’il s’agissait de le traduire en entier, et de l’éclaircir sous le rapport de la doctrine qu’il renferme. . . Outre l’obscurité de la matière en elle-même, les anciens avaient des raisons de ne pas s’expliquer plus clairement sur ces sortes de sujets.” The most eminent native commentators of Lao-Tsze’s school are unanimous in declaring that the *Tao-te-King* is, in many passages, extremely hard to understand. M. Stanislas Julien, however, ascribes some of the mysteries which European *savants* have met with to the fanciful system of interpretation they adopted; and, without wishing, in the slightest degree, to represent the *Tao-te-King* as easier than it really is, he is of opinion that by giving up the theories of the early Jesuit missionaries, and of M. Abel Rémusat, we shall find ourselves on comparatively firm ground. What these theories

---

<sup>b</sup> *Ubi supra*, p. 361; cf. Bayle, *Dict.*, art. Maldonat, note k.



were we shall now shew, and, in doing so, our safest plan will be to quote from M. Stanislas Julien's Preface :—

" Carried away by the laudable desire of spreading quickly Christianity in China, and acting under the influence of a conviction which it would be wrong to question, some learned Jesuits endeavoured to shew that the literary monuments of Chinese antiquity contained numerous passages constantly borrowed from our sacred books, and embodied even Catholic doctrines, which God must have granted to the inhabitants of the Celestial Empire through a kind of anticipated revelation, if we reason according to the most orthodox faith. In order to prove this assertion, which was attacked by other missionaries equally learned and respectable (Fathers Régis, Lacharme, Visdelou), Prémare composed a quarto volume, which is preserved at the Imperial library, and which M. Bonetty has published in the *Annales de la Philosophie Chrétienne*. 'The principal object of the *Tao-te-King*,' says Montucci, who adopts this system of interpretation, 'is to establish the singular knowledge of one Supreme Being in three persons.' 'Many passages,' he adds, 'speak so clearly of a Triune God, that whoever reads the book cannot doubt but that the mystery of the Most Holy Trinity was revealed to the Chinese more than five centuries before the coming of our Lord. . . . The study and the publication of this extraordinary volume would, therefore, be of the greatest assistance to the missionaries for the purpose of extending and increasing happily the apostolic labours.' "

" Father Amiot thought he could recognize the true persons of the Trinity in the first sentence of the fourteenth chapter of Lao-Tsze, which he translates thus: 'He who is, as it were, visible, and yet cannot be seen, is named KHI (read I); He whom no one can see, and who does not speak to the ears is, named HI; He who is, as it were, sensible (perceptible by the senses), and whom no one can touch, is named WEI.' "

" M. Rémusat has gone further than the learned missionary. He fancied he had discovered the word 𐤎𐤏𐤍 (Jehovah) in the three syllables, I, HI, WEI, which belong each to a different sentence; and, to tell the truth, the principal object of his memoir on Lao-Tsze is to prove this conjecture, and to establish accordingly that as early as the sixth century B.C. communications had existed between the West and China. 'The true characters,' he says, 'employed here have no meaning; they are simply the signs of sounds foreign to the Chinese language, whether they are articulated together (IHV), or whether they are taken separately (I, H, V). . . . The trigrammaton I-HI-WEI, or IHV, being, as we have already seen, foreign to the Chinese language,' it is interesting to account for its origin. The word seems to me materially identical with that of 'Iaô (alteration of the Hebrew tetragrammaton 𐤎𐤏𐤍, Jehovah), a name which, if we believe Diodorus Siculus, the Jews gave to God. It is very remarkable that the most exact transcriptions of the celebrated name should occur in a Chinese book, for Lao-Tsze has preserved the aspirations which the Greeks could not express with the letters of their alphabet. On the other hand, the Hebrew tetragrammaton is, in the *Tao-te-King*, reduced to three letters. This, no doubt, did not affect the pronunciation, because, according to all probability, the last 𐤍 of 𐤎𐤏𐤍 was not articulated. . . . The fact of a Hebrew or Syriac name occurring in an old Chinese book—this fact which has remained unknown until the present day—is still sufficiently strange; and it is, I think, completely proved, although much remains to be done for the purpose of explaining it in a satisfactory manner. . . . This name, so well preserved in the *Tao-te-King* that the Chinese, as we may say, have known it better and transcribed it more correctly than the Greeks, is a peculiarity quite characteristic. It seems to me beyond doubt, that, under the form it there assumes, it was of Syriac origin, and I consider it as an irrefutable mark of the track which the ideas we designate as Platonician or Pythagorian followed in order to get to China.' "

\* Montucci, *De Studiis Sinicis*, p. 19. 4to, Berolini, 1808.

\* M. Rémusat asserts this, but does not prove it.

The philologico-theological structure so dexterously raised by Montucci, Prémare, and Abel Rémusat, is, as our readers will perceive, very captivating; but, unfortunately, it will not stand investigation. We would be sorry to detract anything from the reputation of M. Rémusat, and if we were so inclined, the high-minded and generous tone of M. Stanislas Julien's criticism would restrain us from all hard censure; yet we must say that in many instances the learning of the former gentleman has proved singularly defective; and whether or not it is from the fact that sources of information are now more abundant than they formerly were, one thing is certain: M. Rémusat's theories should never be accepted but with extreme caution. In the present instance, the three famous syllables upon which such a wonderful *château en Espagne* has been raised, turn out to be the reverse of *étrangers à la langue Chinoise*; for they present in Chinese a clear and rational signification countenanced by the authority of Ho-chang-kang himself, a celebrated philosopher of the Tao-sse school, who lived B.C. 163, and who, according to M. Rémusat, deserves full confidence. "The first syllable, I," says M. Stanislas Julien, "means *colourless*; the second, HI, *without voice or sound*; the third, WEI, *without body*. The puzzling introductory sentence of the fourteenth chapter would, therefore, read thus:—

"You look at him (the Tao), and you see him not: *he is colourless*.

"You listen to him, and you hear him not: *he is without voice*."

"You wish to touch him, and you touch him not: *he is without body*."

This interpretation is sanctioned by the best native commentators, and is to be found, besides, in a considerable fragment from Lao-Tsze's writings preserved in the Paris Imperial library, and forming part of a *recueil* of metaphysical essays.

But the presence of Christian doctrines in the *Tao-te-King* was, we must not forget, explained by M. Abel Rémusat, from considerations not exclusively philological. He admitted, as almost beyond doubt, that Lao-Tsze had journeyed to very remote countries, and whatever might be the discrepancies of authors respecting the particularities of this voyage, he thought that Persia and Syria were probably the regions visited. Now, M. Stanislas Julien has inquired, with the utmost care, into the origin of this tradition, and he has succeeded in tracing it back to a fabulous legend composed by Ko-hong, otherwise called Pao-pou-tsze, nearly ten centuries after the death of our philosopher (towards A.D. 350). The importance of this legend has justified M. Julien in giving a complete translation of it, and it may be compared with the pseudo-biographies of Sakya-muni, quoted by M. Barthélemy Saint Hilaire, in his learned work on Buddhism (part i., chap. 2).

\* See the Preface to the French translation of the *Yu-kiao-li* (*Les Deux Cousins*). Paris: Didier, 1863. 2 vols. 12mo.

† Cf., the following sentence in the *Pend-Nameh*, cap. 1: "His voice is not a sound, nor a language that strikes the ear."

The religious code with which the name of Lao-Tsze is connected bears, as we have already seen, the title, *Tao-te-King*, or, *The Book of the Tao and of Virtue*. Respecting the exact signification of the word *Tao*, considerable differences exist amongst European and American savants:—

“One of the commonest, and probably the original signification of *Tao* is, way or path. Here it appears to have been employed as our word *way* is, when we speak of the ways, i. e., the manner of acting of men, and afterwards, of the way of heaven. It then began to be, and is now used, in language still more philosophical, to denote the way of the development of the universe—the manner of action of the ultimate principle in the evolutionary process. The transition from this to the meaning of truth, i. e., absolute truth, is easily seen. For absolute truth is nothing but the all-pervading and fundamental fact or reality of the universe; the course or way of nature, animate and inanimate. The connection between the unchanging fundamental law of the universe, or absolute truth, and an absolutely right course in human affairs, or reason, is a necessary one; at bottom, the things are identical. . . We have, therefore, *Tao* meaning way, course, method, the way of the universe or the law of the nature, absolute truth, true principles, science, virtue, reason, true doctrine, to speak.”<sup>ε</sup>

Taking altogether the opposite view to the one adopted by Father Prémare and Abel Rémusat, M. Stanislas Julien goes so far as to deny that *Tao* can be understood at all in the sense of the *Λόγος*; the word, he says, excludes every idea of an intelligent cause, and must be translated merely as the *way*, “in giving to that term a wide and elevated signification corresponding to the language of native philosophers, when they speak of the power and greatness of the *Tao*.”<sup>κ</sup> With due deference to Mr. Stanislas Julien, we think that from Lao-Tsze the identity of the *Tao* with the Gnostic Eons can easily be proved, and that for the Chinese sage the *Tao* was not only “the way,”<sup>ι</sup> but “the truth and the life.”

The origin of all things is accounted for by the *Tao-te-King* on the principle of emanation. A few quotations illustrating this fact may not be uninteresting:—

“‘The nameless Being is the origin of heaven and of earth. With a name, that Being is the mother of all things.’ (Book 1, cap. 1.) . . . The visible forms of the great virtue emanate exclusively from the *Tao*. The nature of the *Tao* is as follows: He is vague, He is indistinct.’ How indistinct, how vague He is! Within Him there are images. How indistinct, how vague He is! Within Him there are beings. How deep, how obscure he is! Within Him there is a spiritual essence, and His spiritual essence is profoundly true. Within Him resides the infallible evidence (of what He is); from the ancient times to the present one, His name has not passed. He gives issue (birth) to all beings. How know I that it is thus for all beings? I know it by the *Tao* (i. 21.) The return to non-existence (produces) the movement of the *Tao*. [A Chinese commentator on this passage, quoted by M. Stanislas Julien, says: ‘The movements of the *Tao*, that is to say, the impulse which the *Tao* gives

<sup>ε</sup> Meadows, *The Chinese and their Rebellions*, p. 354-55; cf. also the extracts from Morrison's *Dictionary*, given p. 350-51.

<sup>κ</sup> *Tao-te-King*, Introd. xiv.

<sup>ι</sup> In the style of the Persian Sufies, a man who walks according to the rules of spirituality, is called a *man of the way*.

<sup>λ</sup> The French epithet, *confus*, can scarcely be rendered here by *confused*.

to beings, has for its root, for its origin, the return (to non-existence). If they did not return to non-existence (the Tao) could not impart unto them movement. They must condense themselves, contract themselves (decrease), in order to attain, afterwards, all the plenitude of their development. That is why the return to non-existence allows the Tao to impart movement to all beings, that is to say, to bring them to life again (xi. 40).] The Tao has produced one; one has produced two; two has produced three; three has produced all creatures [Commentator: one has produced two, that is to say, one has divided itself into male (*yang*) principle and female (*in*) principle. Same comment.: Two has produced three; the male and female principles have united and produced harmony, (ii. 42).] The Tao produces creatures, virtue sustains them. They give to them a body, and perfect them by a secret impulse. [Comment.: The virtue to which the author here alludes is the manifestation of the Tao in created beings. The Tao has diffused itself like a river; it has manifested itself externally (in creatures), and has become virtue (xi. 51)."]

These extracts will shew the reader what is the character of Lao-Tsze's cosmogony, and suggest points of comparison which it would be interesting to follow out, did time and space permit of our doing so. The doctrine of a *male-female* principle formed a notable part of the Egyptian\* and Orphic† tenets, as we find from the monuments of antiquity. All the Gnostic schools maintained the eternity and the incomprehensibility of the Supreme Being, describing the intelligences to which he gave existence as unfoldings (διαθέσεις) of himself.‡ According to the wise men of Egypt, Ammon (the πατήρ ἀγνωστος of the Gnostics), not being able to produce anything immediately, evolved from himself by his voice (cf. the *Logos*) Neith, a female principle, which, by its union with Ammon, became the divine mother of all things. Neith was not distinct from Ammon, but a mere unfolding of his essence, the generating female principle. The Eons of Basilides, Valentine, and the Ophites, have their exact counterparts in the *Tao-te-king*, and though the Pleroma of Valentine is more complicated than that of our author; its distinctive character is the same. Ocellus Lucanus alludes likewise to the active principle (τὸ ποιοῦν) and to the passive one (τὸ πάσχον),§ like Lao-Tsze. Plotinus teaches us that the generation of created beings is the necessary manifestation of the attributes of God in the universe. All the existences and all the forces of which the universe is composed are only a development of the Divine thought, which goes on dividing itself more and more in proportion as it is removed from the first principle.¶ The scientific and complicated structure of Kabbalistic theology may also be named as affording an interesting parallel.

For Lao-Tsze, as well as for all pantheists, the great business of man is to attain a permanent state of *disembodiment*, and to become identified with the *Tao*. Let him, therefore, subdue his senses, annihilate them, and attain, even here below, a complete state of inaction and impassibility. The secret of true life, strange as the paradox may

\* Jablonski, *Panth. Egypt.*, i., cap. ii.

† Orphic. in *Fragment. Philos. Græc.*, edit. Didot.

‡ Matter, *Hist. du Gnosticisme*, vol. i.

§ Edit. Batteux, pp. 59, 96.

• Plotin, *Enneads*, ii., 9.

seem, is non-existence:<sup>p</sup> in the same way non-acting is the appointed way of becoming finally identified with the *Tao*. The only *real* principle in existence is the *Tao*, all others being merely evolutions or manifestations of him. Hence the law of the *Tao* may be described as the law of laws, and the science of the *Tao* is the only one worth following after. As a matter of consequence, the code of ethics inculcated in the *Tao-te-King* is a system of quietism, leading, as has always been the case amongst the Buddhists, to ascetic absurdities of the grossest character. But if the uprooting of all human passions is commanded by the Lao-Tsze, all virtues, all ideas of right and of duty, are equally suppressed: man abandons his own existence and that of the persons with whom he is associated. This lamentable species of quietism, which prevails so extensively amongst Eastern nations, must not be confounded with humility and charity. It is a refined kind of selfishness, which views action as an annoyance, and shrinks from the noble battle of life.

"The holy man makes his occupation of *non-acting*, and makes his re-acting consist in silence" (i. ap. 2).

"When the wise man governs, he constantly aims at rendering the people ignorant and free from desires. He manages in such a way that those who are learned dare no longer act. He practises the *non-acting*, and then everything is well governed" (ii., 3).

"The holy man does not struggle, therefore no one in the empire can struggle with him. [Comment. 'If we dispute, it is because we have the *ego*, that is, our own individuality. The holy man does not dispute, because he is free from the *ego*. The finest virtue is to be free from the *ego*; and then, which man in the empire can dispute or struggle with us?' (i., 22).]

"In the world there are very few men who know how to instruct without speaking,\* and who can derive profit from *non-acting*" (ii., 43).

"Without leaving my house, I know the universe; without looking out of the window, I discover the ways of heaven. The more one travels, the less one learns" (ii., 47).

The following idea of the origin of law is worth noting:—

"In the world, when all men have been able to appreciate (moral) beauty, then the ugliness (of vice) has appeared. When all men have been able to appreciate good, then evil has appeared" (i., 2).

The pattern-man, the *justum et tenacem propositi virum*, is thus portrayed by Lao-Tsze, and after him by a commentator who is still more eloquent:—

"The holy man places himself after others, and therefore he becomes the first. He disengages himself from his body, and his body is preserved. Is it not because he has no private interests? Therefore he can succeed in his private interests."—[Comment. 'Why cannot man subsist eternally like the heaven and the earth? It is because he allows himself to be blinded by what he hears and sees; because he allows himself to be deceived by his sensations and his perceptions. His body, which is nothing but a vain thing, keeps him in bonds of iron; he seeks with too much ardour the means of gaining a livelihood; he knows how to suppress neither his disordered passions nor his sensual

<sup>p</sup> Cf. the *Pend-Nameh*, edit. Sacy, p. 66, and the Arabic proverb quoted, p. 73.

\* On the merits of silence, see the passages quoted by M. Silvester de Sacy, in his translation of the *Pend-Nameh*, pp. 24, 25, edit. 1819.

<sup>r</sup> Cf. the well-known French couplet: "Rarement à courir le monde on devient plus homme de bien."

appetites. Hence it is that the holy man uproots and drives away the illusions of the age; he stoops down for the purpose of feeding his will, and he forgets his body, in order to preserve his purity. All men are fond of rising; he alone likes to humble and abase himself. They like to make themselves great; he alone seeks to appear soft and mean. They all contend for the first place; he withdraws, as if out of pusillanimity. He places himself after others, and places others before him.\* That is why men honour him, and assign to him the first rank. Men seek occupation with eagerness; he alone diminishes his desires. They esteem their person; he alone forgets his body. They desire life; he alone learns to die. He sets no value on life, therefore death cannot reach him' (i., 7)."

Lao-Tsze seems as if he had studied the doctrines of the Stoics, and been trained at the school of Zeno. Some of the maxims he inculcates are truly excellent; but they must be taken independently, and without any reference to the *ensemble* of his views, which, considered as a whole, will not bear investigation. We must also notice that the indifference he and his disciples professed respecting all sub-lunary beings led a commentator of the *Tao-te-King* to make assertions, the morality of which is, to say the least, extremely questionable:—

"An ancient writer said: 'He who loves life may be killed; he who loves purity may be stained; he who loves glory may be covered with shame; he who loves perfection may lose it. But if man remains a stranger to (bodily) life, who can slay him? If he remains a stranger to purity, who can soil him? If he remains a stranger to glory, who can dishonour him? If he remains a stranger to perfection, who can make him lose it? He who understands this can laugh both at life and at death' (ii. 50)."

We have considered the ethics of the *Tao-te-King* with respect to their influence on private life: let us now see, for a few minutes, how the doctrine of *non-acting* would tell upon the relations between a king and his subjects. Writers on the science of government, such as Plato, Sir Thomas More, Hobbes and Rousseau, have almost uniformly started from an *a priori* hypothesis, which they consider as self-evident, and from which they draw conclusions generally disproved by actual facts. If we adopt Lao-Tsze's views, we must admit, in the first place, the existence of a non-acting community, a nation of quietists. But how will such a community have originated? Can we suppose that it is naturally so perfect? If, on the contrary, quietism has been inculcated upon them, who has been the apostle of the new doctrine? and by what extraordinary means will he have transformed a set of barbarians into a nation of humble, peaceful, docile sceptics?

We shall suppose, however, that the model nation exists. The next question arises, How is it to be governed? Amongst the multitude of non-acting, contemplative beings, one steps forward whose qualities, even in this respect, are really transcendent. He places himself below the others; he shuns glory as much as others shun dis-

\* "Although thou mayest be wise and full of talents, always place thyself below the ignorant" (*Pend-Nameh*, cap. 41).

† Cf. *Pend-Nameh*, cap. 52, edit. Sacy, p. 165.

‡ We see here broadly stated that indifference to morality which was characteristic of some of the mystic sects of the middle ages.

grace: the body is for him the source of all calamities; his own weighs down upon him like a heavy burden. If he is ill-used, he abstains from all resistance. He recompenses injuries by kindness. Always master of himself, he is the same for the evil and for the good. Free from desires, from passions, from disquietude, having neither the anxiety of the mind nor that of the heart, he is evidently designed for the supreme rank. "If the king gives himself up to action, he has desires; if he has desires, the people is disturbed and agitated; if the people is disturbed and agitated, the king loses the affection of his subjects. This affection once lost, the multitude abandons him, and his relatives avoid him. We see thereby that by giving oneself up to actions, one is incapable of becoming master of the empire."<sup>v</sup>

A government founded upon such superhuman gentleness is of course perfectly incompatible with honorific distinctions. Nor is there any room for an aristocracy. The king, indeed, is scarcely entitled to such a name. He is more like a *primus inter pares*, or like the elder of a Church. "Although the three ministers have each a table of precious stone to conceal their face when they present themselves before the sovereign; although the emperor has a team of five docile horses, all this is insufficient to render them honourable. True glory consists in cultivating the Tao."<sup>v</sup> In fact, there is really no difference between man and man. "In the order of nature, the princes and kings are of the same nature as the humble man of the people. If the people submit themselves to them, from private individuals that they were, they become princes and kings. If the people forsake them, from princes and kings that they were, they descend into the class of private individuals. We see thereby that the nobility and the elevation of princes and kings have for their basis the abject class of the common people."<sup>z</sup>

If the theory of non-acting must seem strange and paradoxical, it is certainly in China where bureaucracy is carried to its extreme limits, and where action is multiplied to an unprecedented extent. One of the commentators of the *Tao-te-King* remarks that, just as is the case of a small fish, you handle it gently when you want to cook it, for fear of crushing it; so, "when you govern a kingdom, you must not take much trouble, nor establish a multitude of laws and regulations, for fear of tormenting your inferiors, and of exciting them to disorder" (p. 221). And in another place: "When the prince observes non-acting, when he avoids it to create a multitude of laws, the people enjoy peace, and give to him all their affections. If, on the contrary, the administration becomes troublesome and vexatious, the people revolt, and know only to hate their ruler" (p. 210). We see from these quotations that the ideal of government, according to Lao-Tsze, is *laissez faire, laissez passer*, and

<sup>v</sup> Comment. on i., p. 179.

<sup>z</sup> Comment. on ii., 62, p. 230, cf. the well-known passage in Pascal: "Cela est admirable! on ne veut pas que j'honore un homme vêtu de brocatelle, et suivi de sept ou huit laquais! . . . Cet habit, c'est une force" (*Pensées*, edit. Havet., p. 68.)

<sup>a</sup> Comment. on ii., 39, p. 148.

that it is inconsistent with restrictive or prohibitive measures of any kind whatever.

We can now fancy that such an imaginary nation as the one dreamed of by Lao-Tsze would live quietly and happily, realizing almost the fictions of the golden age, and presenting to the astonished bystander a kind of paradise upon earth. But suppose the case of a man belonging to that community beginning to think for himself, and to feel springing within his soul that desire for action, that thirst for higher things, which is one of the noblest elements of our nature. Lao-Tsze meets the difficulty with the plain declaration, that the people must be always kept *in statu pupillari* (p. 182). "The prince must render the people ignorant and exempt from desire, in order to bring them back to their original purity and simplicity" (pp. 211, 244). "The arts and sciences are useless, nay, worse than useless, because, when they are once cultivated, we see appearing a number of objects as strange as they are futile, which become for the empire instruments of trouble and disorder" (p. 212). The people, too, are much the worse for the arts of civilization, because, "in order that the king may wear dresses of silk of various colours, and feed on exquisite viands, he must weigh down his subjects with taxes, and rob them of their riches. *Hoc est quod agunt prædones*" (p. 195). Another safe precaution is, to take away from the people the anxiety for travelling. Let every one keep at home, satisfied with what he sees around him, striving to destroy within his own soul the rising sparks of ambition and energy,<sup>v</sup> and happy at being under the rule of a kind of pantheist abbé Myriel, who endeavours to convince him that *l'homme qui médite est un animal dépravé*.<sup>s</sup>

We have now given, as briefly and yet as completely as we could, an idea of the work, for a French translation of which we are indebted to M. Stanislas Julien. The reader who wishes to see the difference between the system of Confucius and that of Lao-Tsze cannot do better than consult the pseudo-biography which serves as an introduction to the *Tao-te-King*. It is pretty clear that the quietist theories just examined in this article were the result of a very natural re-acting against the common-place matter of fact, utilitarian doctrines taught by Confucius. Lao-Tsze himself did not at first obtain much popularity, and he was regarded rather as a solitary, exceptional case of superhuman virtue, than as the founder of a new faith. It was about the year 140 after Christ that the Tao-sse, or philosophers following Lao-Tsze, rose into notoriety; and since that time they have constantly been gaining ground, although their original tenets are now very much deteriorated by the admission of pretended incantations and ceremonies which have often caused them to be laughed at as vulgar impostors.<sup>a</sup>

<sup>v</sup> Cf. Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables*.

<sup>s</sup> J. J. Rousseau, *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*.

<sup>a</sup> See also, on the *Tao-te-King*, an interesting account by M. Franck, in his *Etudes Orientales*, pp. 165—181.



*L'Eglise et la Révolution Française ; histoire des relations de l'Eglise et de l'Etat de 1789 à 1802.* Par E. DE PRESSENSÉ. 8vo. Paris : Meyrueis.

THE history of the French revolution has been too long considered as chiefly, if not exclusively, a history of riots, battles, diplomatic negotiations, and parliamentary debates. In dealing with this momentous epoch, writers have taken too little notice of the intellectual and religious state of society ; they have unaccountably neglected to examine the causes which brought about the revolution, and to shew what secret links connected the new society with the *ancien régime*. M. de Tocqueville was the first historian who attempted to give us a philosophical account of the subject ; unfortunately, death struck him down in the midst of his labours, but he lived long enough to found a school, and we are glad to see, throughout the different portions of the field of history, labourers at work who have evidently caught the spirit of their master.

In the foremost ranks of such men we must name M. Edmond de Pressensé, the author of the volume the title of which we have just transcribed. One of the most distinguished ministers of the Protestant church in Paris, known already by his excellent *Histoire des trois premiers siècles de l'Eglise Chrétienne*, M. de Pressensé was better qualified than any one else to deal with the weighty topic which forms the staple of his new work. He is, indeed, a staunch friend of religious liberty ; like the late Alexander Vinet, he considers that every responsible being not only has the right, but is under the obligation of expressing freely his convictions ; and therefore, whilst sympathizing most sincerely with the great movement of 1789, he sees and shews to his readers, in the clearest manner, how the golden opportunity of establishing the imprescriptible claims of conscience, and of determining the true position of the Church, was missed from the erroneous principles under the influence of which both parties were acting. On the one hand, the champion of the old system, totally disregarding the feeling of irritation against the clergy, which their own vices and gross neglect of duty had created on all sides, would not abate one jot of their pretensions ; on the other, the revolutionists, conscious that the religious idea is, and must ever be, an essential part of man's nature, and therefore a powerful element of social and political government, wanted to reduce the clergy to the position of mere tools of the secular authority. The spirit of Bossuet, and that of Jean Jacques Rousseau were in antagonism ; what was to be the result ?

M. de Pressensé has, in his introductory chapter, very lucidly explained the radical effects of Gallicanism, and shewn that, in the sphere of religion, it was the strict carrying out of the principle of centralization which has always been the chief characteristic of administration in France :

" We see it," says our author ; " the Gallican church, rich and powerful as it was, had no other position than that of a very dependant State church. We praise it for having resisted the influence of Ultramontaniam ; we acknowledge

that it has been graced by prelates of brilliant talent and of admirable virtue; its glory is inseparable from that of our country, but it has, nevertheless, sacrificed more than one precious liberty to the great French idol—we mean the State. It has forged, or allowed others to forge for it, a yoke which would become unsufferable as soon as it was imposed by the votes of an assembly, instead of being offered by royal hands. For we shall see that in order to enslave the Church, the French revolution has had nothing else to do but to draw the consequences of the principles established by Louis XIV. and Bossuet. At all events, closely associated as it was during the eighteenth century with all the iniquities of the *ancien régime*, surpassing them in evil by those which it perpetrated on its own account, the French church excited the strongest opposition without honouring itself by lofty virtues; for nothing is more sad to contemplate than its moral status, until the day when it rose through martyrdom and purified itself in its own blood." (p. 12.)

From this quotation, and from the numerous facts adduced with such care by M. de Pressensé, we see that in the sphere of religion, as well as in every other, the fundamental principle which M. de Tocqueville enunciated holds good, namely, that the revolutionary government, acting under the inspiration of the theoreticians of the Rousseau school, simply carried out the ideas of Louis XIV.; and, accordingly, when we say that the spirit of Bossuet was, on the eve of the reign of terror, brought into antagonism with that of the "Genevese philosopher," we must be understood to mean, respectively, belief and disbelief in the essentials of Christianity.

On the question of religious toleration, the greater part of the liberals were agreed, that is to say, they admitted the duty of restoring the non-Catholics to their rights as citizens; but, by the most lamentable inconsistency, they wanted to deprive the Catholics themselves of the right of worshipping God according to their conscience; and, in fact, we may say that if some of the most advanced revolutionists were so well disposed towards the Jews, the Protestants, and other members of the religious minority, it was only because they considered them as not influential enough to oppose any measure which might be subsequently introduced by the secular power. To this singular method of interpreting religious liberty, we must ascribe the glaring paradoxes which disfigure the speeches of Mirabeau, and other of the leading orators in the assembly. Side by side with great truths forcibly asserted, we find sophisms of the grossest kind—the natural result of that ignorance of practical religion which the Gallican clergy had, we must say, encouraged and illustrated by its own example. It is curious to follow, in M. de Pressensé's instructive book, the discussions relative to Church property. We shall quote a fragment from the chapter referring to this subject:—

"Garat entered into the heart of the question when he reviewed all the restrictions imposed by the laws on the free use of Church property, such as the prohibition from increasing or alienating them without a special authorization. He invoked the constant traditions of the old monarchy, which conferred to the prince the right of nominating to bishoprics and abbeys, of enjoying the revenues of vacant benefices, and even of dividing or uniting the property of the Church. The nation had always interposed in the question of foundations, so much so that when certain funds were not sufficient to defray the expenses of religious

services, the heirs at law were obliged to make up the deficiency. From these incontestable principles, Garat drew a consequence which was really enormous. The State, he maintained, is so completely the master of religion, that it has the right of abolishing the Christian religion, its worship and its ministers, and of applying the funds it now enjoys to the support of a more moral creed, supposing (which is impossible) there should be one better than the faith now professed. 'It is essential,' he said, in finishing, 'that functionaries should be paid by the nation; if they are proprietors, they can be independent.' Garat's speech thus combined, in a dangerous mixture, truth and error; its conclusion shewed how much the evil genius of Rousseau's *contrat social* was presiding over the whole discussion." (p. 67.)

In another passage, M. de Pressensé proves still more forcibly that both parties were egregiously inconsistent in this memorable debate. The National Assembly had very properly refused to adopt a State religion; to the fanatical upholders of the union between the throne and the altar, it had said that religious opinions are not a fit subject for votes; that the claims of conscience cannot be interfered with; and that no one has the right of making his own views paramount over those of others. At the same time, the principle of a church salaried by the State was carried, on the ground that "religious worship is a duty for all; that all are considered to avail themselves of it; and that the 'Holy Militia' is supported, as the army, for the benefit of all." Now, as M. de Pressensé observes, if the Catholic form of worship is proclaimed as a *universal duty*, we cannot see what difference there is between such an assertion and the old one which acknowledges the "Catholic, apostolic, and Roman faith, as the only recognized form of religion." On the other hand, the conservative members belonging to the clergy and nobility were equally conspicuous for their want of logic. Whilst they refused the salary offered by the government, on the plea of the independence of the Church, they insisted, in the very same breath, on the government's formally adopting the Catholic faith. By so doing, they placed themselves on the ground of legal proscriptions, which, if they were favourable to them now, might, the next day, be made use of against them, without their having any reason to complain.

The *constitution civile du clergé*, as it is called, was a kind of *mezzo termine*, which could satisfy neither the Church nor the revolutionists. After the death of the king, it became evident that the destruction of everything bearing the slightest reference to Christianity was the aim of the monsters who composed the committee of public safety. The Convention established the worship of Reason on what it was pleased to call the ruins of superstition; and in the disgraceful scenes which then took place, Grégoire, bishop of Blois, was the only one who was bold enough to bear witness to the faith of Christ. For a full account of this noble manifestation, we must refer our readers to M. de Pressensé's eloquent narrative (p. 273—276).

After the events of Thermidor, the spirit of persecution did not immediately cease; and both Tallien and his friends seemed determined upon carrying on the reign of terror with only very slight modifications. However, the reaction against the tyranny of the Convention was too

strong to be long disregarded; and as soon as the penal restrictions upon public worship were removed, the votaries of Reason found themselves in the minority.

"The sense of the infinite," says M. de Pressensé, "is alone capable of originating a religion. If men do not meet for their business or their pleasure, the only bond of association is a divine thought. You will never be capable of bringing them together, or of influencing them for the sake of mere abstractions. Neither patriotic hymns, nor lectures on the Constitution, and on agriculture, could temper the intolerable dullness of the Republican festivals; people soon declared themselves *blasés* on the touching spectacle of old age contrasting with infancy. The solemn anniversary of the Reproduction of Beings was amusing enough; but the unavoidable sermon on the rights of citizens, and on the cultivation of the potato-plant, could not take the place of the sacred texts for which the soul of man yearns, because they remind him of his heavenly country." (p. 323.)

We wish time allowed us to follow M. de Pressensé in his impartial and lucid appreciation of the Directoire, the Consulate, and the Empire. It is a mistake to say that a *coup d'état* brought back religion into France just as a *coup d'état* had suppressed it. Religion is beyond the influence of such causes; when external pressure is made to bear upon it, its outward manifestation cannot, of course, take place; but it never dies, and as soon as the pressure is removed, the greatest enemies of Christianity see that their theories are vain when compared with the faith of the Cross. Grégoire played a conspicuous part in the religious revival which followed the inauguration of liberty of worship: assisted by a numerous band of faithful ecclesiastics, he endeavoured to diffuse everywhere sound principles, and the Christianity which he preached—Jansenist in its essential tendencies,—was a great improvement on the State-Catholicism of the pre-revolutionary epoch.

Under the influence of really liberal ideas, the respective positions of the Church and the State might, after some time, have become recognized; but the Empire interfered, and the ministers of religion sank once more to the condition of paid functionaries, of servants of the civil power, just as they were in the palmy days of Louis XIV.

---

*Philosophie. De la Connaissance de Dieu.* Par A. GRATRY, Prêtre de l'Oratoire de l'Immaculée Conception. Second Edition. Two Vols. 12mo. Paris. 1864.

THE work of the Abbé Gratry, which we would introduce to the notice of the Christian public, is one of paramount value, whether we consider the subject discussed, the position of the author, or finally the point of view from which he has treated the great question of theodicy. Two short extracts from the *avant-propos* will place in a very clear and unmistakeable light the fundamental axioms of the whole treatise:—

"According to us, the attempt to separate philosophy from theology is as false as if any one wished to separate mathematical from physical science, and to study metaphysics without taking into consideration the visible creation and the mysteries of geometry. Those who aim at isolating reason from supernatural teaching are as mistaken as the idealists, who want to discuss it apart from the physical light of the senses. . . . We believe, on the other hand, according to the

affirmation of the Council of Amiens, that when we treat of the work of reason there are two excesses to avoid: the one which proclaims the absolute impotency of human reason; the other, which considers every truth, even religious, as an emanation of that faculty. We believe, as the Council does, that it is an error contrary to the uniform teaching of Catholic schools, to attack natural reason as powerless, and to question the worth of the solid arguments which demonstrate the existence of God, and the other great truths designated by theology as the *preambles of faith*. The Council, following the tradition of the Christian church, declares these truths to be within the reach of reason, and susceptible of being proved by it."

These declarations are sufficiently plain; we have before us a clergyman acknowledging the legitimacy of metaphysical research, and setting forth the claims of reason with as much eloquence as some of his *confrères* would spend in denouncing them. This, we repeat, gives additional value to the work we are now noticing, and makes an examination of it particularly interesting.

The Abbé Gratry begins by sketching in gloomy, but very true, colours the state of the public mind at the present time. Twenty-five years ago people were wont to complain of the general indifference for religious truth. Reason, said Lamennais, threatened to upset faith. Now, the burden of our lamentation must be completely altered, and the calamity which is drawing near is nothing else than the downfall, the perversion of reason itself. A profound thinker, M. Joubert, was foretelling as far back as 1820 the rapid strides of ignorance, and our speedy return to a state of barbarity. What would he have said had he seen the results of that pretended progress made by human reason, progress in literature and in philosophy so loudly talked of by our contemporary *savants*? We need scarcely allude here to works of art: in the sphere of poetry and of fiction, generally, the decay is so universally admitted, *now*, that the boldest novators would not attempt to contradict it. As for philosophy, what are we reduced to? the old materialism of d'Holbach, Lamettrie, and Cabanis; a few worn-out sentences borrowed from Bacon and Condillac; a great respect for everything that can be touched, weighed, and counted; a thorough dread for all that is of a spiritual nature. We boast of our progress in scientific knowledge; but in astronomy, for instance, we do nothing but apply the wonderful theories of Kepler and Newton. If we turn to pure mathematics, we find that Descartes and Leibnitz are our guides, and that far from improving upon these illustrious men, we cannot make use of the magnificent inheritance they have left us. Not only human reason has failed to realize the progress which a few sophists anticipated and proclaimed, but it has so far abdicated its legitimate rights, that the name of *philosophy* is now usurped by a school of madmen who have taught, and are still teaching successfully, a system founded upon downright absurdity. "The essential character of absurdity," continues M. Gratry, "its visible form, is evidently what we call a *contradiction in terms*; as when one says, yes is no, good is evil, being and non-existence are identical. Such is the general formula of absurdity." Now Hegel and his disciples are responsible for endeavouring to establish this monstrous paradox. Their theory, reduced to its simplest form, is

as follows: we can both affirm and deny the same qualities of the same subject viewed from the same standpoint. Hence atheism, the destruction of human liberty and responsibility, and the open avowal that between good and evil there is no difference whatever. The whole social organization is reversed, and anarchy proclaimed by M. Proudhon as the proper aim of modern politicians.

M. Gratry, after unfolding the appalling picture, concludes that the only remedy consists at the present time in restoring human reason to its legitimate position, and in giving it a severe training. "We must distinguish scientifically between sophistry and philosophy. . . . Taking a direction contrary to that which contemporary eclecticism has adopted, philosophy must at last and necessarily excommunicate its domestic enemies, instead of saluting and embracing them." M. Gratry has, above all things, the great merit of seeing that the normal and healthy development of thought is inseparable from a right condition of the soul. No intellectual advance can take place unless there is a corresponding progress of moral liberty. This important point once admitted, we shall be convinced that the submission of our reason to the law of God is not the destruction of reason, but its highest perfection. Faith will appear what it really is, "the final step taken by our intellect," to speak like Pascal; quoting the words of Thomas Aquinas, "*Hoc modo lumen scientiæ non offuscatur, sed magis clarescit in anima Christi per lumen scientiæ divinæ*;" and in the same manner the parallel culture of reason and faith in ourselves will make us capable of grasping all the truths which it behoves us to know.

The *Traité de la connaissance de Dieu* is not only a theoretical work, but a contribution to the history of philosophy. M. Gratry believes that the inductive method of reasoning, as applied to the proofs of the existence of God, is far superior to the syllogistic or deductive; and in his review of the principal systems that have obtained since the earliest stage of metaphysical research, he endeavours to establish this beyond the possibility of doubt. The writers whose opinions he discusses are Plato, Aristotle, St. Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, the great French metaphysicians of the seventeenth century, and Leibnitz. M. Gratry is full of enthusiasm for Plato. He supposes, in common with St. Justin and Thomas Aquinas, that the disciple of Socrates knew the book of Genesis and followed its teaching.

"Is it possible," says he, "that Plato was not acquainted with oriental traditions? Is it possible that amongst these traditions he knew nothing of the Jews, whom their zeal and their activity carried everywhere? . . . Plato sought after truth with all his mind, with all his heart, with all his love, with his whole soul, as he himself says it should be sought; he examined every tradition, and travelled incessantly for the purpose of discovering the origin of these traditions; he constantly invoked, and we have the proof of this in his writings, a special and actual assistance of God to know the truth; nor was this help refused to him; and he thus enjoyed the privilege of becoming acquainted with sound philosophy."

M. Gratry, in speaking of the orthodox metaphysicians of the seventeenth century, remarks that they should be treated "*comme un*

seul homme ou plutôt un chœur de voix." If we make an allowance for the small differences arising from the necessary variety of constitutions, habits, and modes of thinking, we find throughout the whole group of Christian *savants* a wonderful harmony.

"God was the chief object of research for the philosophers of the seventeenth century, because they knew that He is the First Truth and Universal Light. Certainly these men, gifted with practical common sense, did not meditate their demonstrations in order to convince themselves of the existence of God. But they felt that there is the centre of philosophy, the substratum of metaphysics, the whole question of method, the science of the soul, the point of contact of logic and ethics, the foundation of physical science, the key, so long sought, of geometry. Kepler, the most ancient representative of the pleiad, works at science, and studies the heavens only, 'that he may make a tabernacle for his God.' The others have the same end in view: Descartes, Pascal, Malebranche, Fénelon and Bossuet, Leibnitz, Clarke and Newton, Thomanin and Petau; the two last named insufficiently known, because they have written in Latin. They all seek God by every direction of thought, and all their voices are in the same key and sing to the same tune; the subject is, the Supreme Being and his infinite perfection; and everything contributes to the marvellous symphony, from theology, by its dogmatic decisions, down to mathematics themselves, through the admirable invention of Leibnitz."

M. Gratry is not satisfied with shewing how the most illustrious thinkers of former days have demonstrated the existence of God; he gives his own theory on the subject, and his argumentation, which occupies the second part of the work now under consideration, is extremely striking, from the novelty of some of the proofs adduced by the author. In order to appreciate correctly this we must remember the particular training of M. Gratry's mind. Originally destined to the scientific profession, he entered the Ecole Polytechnique as a pupil, and his deep mathematical studies have affected in a considerable measure the theological pursuits which, at a later period, absorbed all his attention. This is, we believe, a very great advantage, and it has given to the productions of M. Gratry a character of originality which adds much to their beauty. The boast of scientific men, of Auguste Comte's disciples in particular, has always been that a thorough acquaintance with mathematics, natural phenomena, and physical laws, would finally eliminate from amongst us the theological *superstitions* upon which the world has lived for so long. Now Kepler, Leibnitz, Descartes and Newton are there to prove just the reverse; and M. Gratry aims at establishing that the demonstration of the existence of God is precisely of the same nature as the fundamental truths of infinitesimal calculus. Time will not allow of our going throughout all the ingenious reasoning contained in the *Traité de la Connoissance de Dieu*, but we must give a paragraph or two by way of specimen:—

"The infinitesimal process in mathematics, just like the Platonic and Cartesian demonstrations of the existence of God, goes from contingent to necessary, from finite to infinite, from variable to eternal, from individual to universal; and it proceeds exactly in the same manner, doing away with all the limits of contingency and of variation, disengaging the essence in particular realities, carrying on to zero what is accidental, and what is essential to infinitude. Therefore the infinitesimal process in mathematics is exactly a particular case and application of a universal and fundamental method, by virtue of which

the human mind, in an act as sublime as certain as it is simple, rises from every finite datum to what is infinite.

"The same general law measures correctly the relations between the finite and the infinite, either in geometry or in metaphysics. Now, applied to geometry, it produces wonders, and the result it gives is infallibly certain. Is it possible that, applied to metaphysics, it should end in nothing but error?"

The *Connaissance de Dieu*, let us say as we conclude, is the first part of a whole course of philosophy, three divisions of which are now published. The question of Pantheism might by some have been included under the head of theodicy; M. Gratry has preferred dealing with it in his volume on logic, because modern Pantheism, that of Hegel, which is the most scientific and complete of all similar systems, is only the necessary consequence of logic such as the upholders of absolute identity understand it. We shall take another opportunity of discussing this question somewhat more thoroughly.

---

*The Book of Psalms. A New Translation, with Introductions and Notes, Explanatory and Critical.* By J. J. STEWART PEROWNE, B.D., Vice-Principal and Professor of Hebrew in St. David's College, Lampeter, etc. Vol. I. London: Bell and Dalby, Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. 1864.

A NEW translation of the Psalms of David by an accomplished Hebrew scholar and a professor in an important college, deserves some notice at our hands. We were anxious to know what school or line of interpretation he followed, how far he had succeeded in unravelling difficult passages, what was in his opinion the date of the different Psalms, and various other matters connected with the inspired work which he has taken in hand. We propose to give the reader the same information on these several subjects which we have derived ourselves from a careful survey of Mr. Perowne's book; and if we have been partially disappointed, we cannot but bear witness to the temperate judgment and accurate learning which he has brought to bear upon his task, though it has evidently been to him not a task, but a *gratum opus*,—a labour of love. In his preface he says, in reference to the version:—

"I am not so presumptuous as to assert that where others have failed, I have succeeded: I can only say I have striven to the utmost to produce a faithful, but not a servile translation. Perhaps it is hardly necessary to add, that a new translation implies no disparagement to our Authorized Version. To the many excellencies of that version, no one can be more alive than I am: the more it is studied, the more these will be appreciated; the more its noble simplicity, its unapproachable grandeur, its rhythmic force of expression, will be felt. But it is obvious that since the time when it was made, our knowledge of the grammar of the Hebrew language, of the structure of Hebrew poetry, and of many other subjects tending to the elucidation of the sacred text, has been largely increased. . . . Two or three words not used by our translators, such as the verbs 'to seize,' and 'to sympathize,' I have ventured to employ, where they seemed to me in the particular passage most exactly to convey the meaning of the original words. I have also adhered more closely than is usual in the English version to the order of the words in the Hebrew, because in many instances, as might be expected in a language so antithetical in its structure,



the special force of certain words is thus maintained, or some delicate shade of meaning more clearly brought out, which would otherwise be lost. How far the attempt thus made has been successful, it is for others to judge."

We think, however, that such a word as "sympathize" might have been dispensed with. Its Greek structure reminds us too much of the "scandalize," and "Amen," and other græcised words of the Rheims Testament.

In several of the Psalms the noble majesty of the Authorized Version is fully preserved, but there are weak lines continually occurring; as in Psalm ii. 1, "Why have nations raged *tumultuously*?" where the adverb should certainly have preceded, especially as "raged tumultuously" expresses one word רָעָה in the Hebrew. Is there any reason for rendering in ver. 12 "on *your* way?" Is it not rather, "lose the right way?" Rightly does Mr. Perowne, after due consideration, render in the same verse, "kiss the Son." We transcribe his critical note on the words בָּרַךְ. "The interpretation of these words has been a difficulty. (1.) The Chaldee has כְּבֹד אֱמַס, 'receive instruction;' LXX., δρᾶσθε παιδείας; Vulgate, *apprehendite disciplinam*; בָּרַךְ being thus, as in Aramaic, 'piety, obedience,' etc. (2.) Others have taken it as an adverb. Jerome, *Adorate pure*. Aquinas, *καταφιλήσατε ἐκλεκτῶς*. Symmachus, *προσκυνήσατε καθαρῶς*. (3.) Others, again, 'the chosen one' (from בָּרַךְ), without the article, as בָּרַךְ xxi. 1. (4.) Of the older versions, only the Syriac has בָּרַךְ 'kiss the Son.' Among the Jewish commentators, so Aben Ezra and Maimonides (quoted in Benzey,) who both refer to the בָּרַךְ above. So also Mendels., 'dem Sohne huldiget;' and so Gesenius and De Wette, who cannot be accused of any dogmatic bias in favour of their interpretation. The only objection to this, of any weight, is the Aramaic form of the word בָּרַךְ, which occurs but once again (Prov. xxxi. 2), manifestly a later passage, and not free from other Chaldaisms. Hupfeld, indeed alleges, besides, the absence of the article, and the change of subject in the following verse. The former, however, may be explained by poetic usage, and the latter is not uncommon in Hebrew."

It will be seen by the above renderings, that the verb has been taken in two different senses: (1.) "to cleave, adhere to, lay hold of," etc.,—a sense which is not supported by usage: and (2.) "to kiss," i. e., according to the Eastern custom, to proffer homage and service. Cf. 1 Sam. x. 1. Gen. xli. 40 is probably to be explained in the same way.<sup>b</sup> The word is also used of the worship paid to idols (1 Kings xix. 18; Hosea xiii. 2). We must, therefore, either render (with the Syriac) "Do homage to the Son" or (with Jerome), "Proffer pure homage, worship in purity." Both translations are admissible. Nor does it seem very important which we adopt, though the interpretation of this clause has sometimes been debated, as if with it fell or stood the Messianic character of the Psalm. But that must be de-

<sup>b</sup> See Ges., *Theo.*, p. 923.

terminated by the general scope of the Psalm, not by a single phrase, not to mention that verses 6, 7, are quite as emphatic as verses 12.

Frequently a regard for the correct juxtaposition of words, to accord more nearly with the original, causes a rendering unpleasant to the unlearned reader. Such rendering is Psalm viii. 7, "Sheep, and oxen, all of them;" where the "all of them" is already implied. ix. 6, "The enemy is cut off,—they are perpetual ruins" (though much more correct than the Authorized Version). x. 10, "So he is crushed, sinks down and falls; the helpless (perish) by means of his strength." The personal pronoun is very ambiguous here. xi. 4, "Jehovah,—His throne is in heaven." xxii. 8, "Cast (thyself) upon Jehovah, let him rescue him, let him deliver him, seeing He delighteth in him."

Besides the bad effect of these nominatives absolute, there is a want of roundedness (to coin a word) in many of the lines, and the eye is offended with a multiplicity of parentheses and brackets, as in x. 13, 14, "Wherefore should the wicked despise God? (wherefore should he) say in his heart, Thou wilt not require (it)? Thou hast seen (it); for thou considerest mischief and vexation, that men may put (the matter) into thine hand: the helpless leaveth it to Thee; Thou hast been the helper of the orphan." And what a poor line at the conclusion of this Psalm, "So that mortal man of the earth may no more terrify." It is possible that familiarity with our own versions creates an unreasoning acquiescence in obvious blemishes to be found in them. In obscure passages our translators often forget their accustomed march. Thus, xvi. 4 is obscure; xvii. 14 is harsh and awkward; xxxix. 2 is obscure and bald. Mr. Perowne's version is both more correct and more rhythmical in these and several other instances. In estimating the worth of the translation, we must bear in mind that it is intended for those who are not likely to throw aside the one which they have learned from their mother's lips, and that its main design is to represent the Hebrew text with all its peculiarities. It may be questionable whether, for instance, Psalm li. in our version is not very nearly as literal as Mr. Perowne's version, which, by transposing words, makes it a curious study for the scholar, but will never supersede the Psalter or Bible version. We are not likely to become accustomed to,—“For my transgressions do I know, and my sin is before me ever.” The translation is therefore to be taken, in combination with the notes, as an exposition of the meaning of the writers. We are placed in the attitude of listeners to them as they exhibit the hopes, fears, and religious conceptions of the Jew of periods extending from David to the Babylonish captivity: and in this aspect the work presents itself to our notice more favourably. We must, in reading a Psalm, bear in mind the extent of religious enlightenment possessed by the writer. This we gain partly from a comparison of passages in the Psalms, and partly from other books of the Old Testament. If we come to a perusal of the Psalms with a conviction that every Psalm is more or less Messianic, or that certain Psalms are exclusively so, we must believe that God suddenly unfolded views

which were beyond the writer's apprehension, to his mind, and that they were often done in violation of all the laws of context. David was, then (to take him as one of the writers), rapt in poetic ecstasy to utter short unconnected verses in the very heart of some Psalm which manifestly refers to his own troubled life. Such are the sentiments, more or less, of Thrupp, Phillips, and a large class of theologians, who regard the New Testament as the foundation, the Old as simply subservient to it. But there may be a danger lest by this process the outlines of the real characters of the Old Testament may become so faint that all individuality may be lost. It may safely be said that David's character should be filled in from the history as well as the Psalms. His continual complaint of "enemies of his life" cannot be always spiritually adapted to the tone and times of the New Testament. His maledictions may be explained from the bloodthirsty spirit which pervaded the old dispensation, and was not repugnant to Divine permission. Indeed there is nothing in the Psalms which may not be referred in its primary application to David the man and king. The higher application must rest on express inspired authority in the New Testament, such as St. Peter's (Acts ii. 29—31). We may suppose that the spirit in such passages suggested to the poet "more than met the ear" of his contemporaries. In other passages much has been said to be Messianic which is simply Davidic. We quote Mr. Perowne's remarks on this subject:—

"One class of expositors, of whom Bishop Horsley may be taken as a chief representative, have laid it down as a certain principle, that whenever any part of a Psalm is by any of the writers of the New Testament applied to our Lord, there we are bound to explain the whole Psalm as prophetic of Him. Nay, every Psalm, it has been contended, which may reasonably be held, even without express New Testament sanction, to be Messianic, is Messianic in all its parts, from first to last. For, it is urged, we are otherwise left without compass or star to guide us. Where, if this principle be abandoned, are we to draw the line, or what is to be the criterion of interpretation? . . . But, in the first place, this canon of interpretation fails, because it, at least tacitly, assumes that in all these Psalms the writer is consciously uttering a prediction; that the Psalmist, although he is speaking, it may be, in some lower sense of himself, has ever consciously before the eye of his mind One greater than he, in whom he knew that his words would find their ultimate fulfilment. But there is no proof that such is the case, but rather the reverse. In many Psalms, it seems very evident that the writer is speaking of *himself*, of *his own* sufferings, of *his own* deliverance, apparently without thinking of another; although being a prophet, and therefore a type of Christ, he is led to use unconsciously words which, in their highest and truest sense, are applicable only to Christ.

"In the next place, the difficulties involved in the canon of interpretation to which I refer are far more serious than those which it is intended to surmount. It compels us constantly to take words and phrases in a sense which is obviously not their proper and natural sense. We find in many of these Psalms passages which are said to have been fulfilled in the circumstances of our Lord's life or passion; confessions of sinfulness, maledictions of the writer's enemies, expressions of hatred and revenge; none of which can, in their plain literal sense, be transferred to our Lord. . . .

"How are the words in ver. 12 of Psalm xl., 'my iniquities,' interpreted by Bishop Horsley? I will quote his note on the passage, '*Ærumnæ meæ*' '[my distresses],' says Houbigant; piously thinking that the person who speaks throughout the Psalm had no sins with which to charge himself. But since

God 'laid upon him the iniquities of us all,' therefore the Messiah, when He is personated in the Psalms, perpetually calls those iniquities His own, of which He bore the punishment.' But, as to Horsley's own interpretation, it is far more indefensible than that which it is intended to supersede. The passage which he quotes in support of his interpretation fails really in its most essential particulars; for that does express the very idea which here is not expressed, and which is only assumed, but not proved, to be implied. There we do not find 'our iniquities' spoken of as the iniquities of Christ, but they are distinctly said, on the one hand, to be 'the iniquities of us all,' and as distinctly said, on the other, to have been 'laid upon Him.' . . . Again, surely it is one thing for us to be told that God *made* Christ sin, and it is quite another thing for our blessed Lord himself to speak of the iniquities of others as His own. As a fact he never does so; and the step in the argument is prodigious. The two ideas have scarcely an intelligible connection. . . . What, then, is the conclusion at which we arrive from these observed facts? Surely it is this; that the Psalms, to a large extent, foreshadow Christ, because the writers of the Psalms are types of Christ; and it is of the very nature of a type to be imperfect. It foretells, in some particulars, but not in all, that of which it is the type. Were it complete in itself, it would not point further: through its very incompleteness it becomes a prophecy. Now, the Psalms are typical. They are the words of holy men of old—of one especially whose life was fashioned in many of its prominent features to be a type of Christ. But just as David's *whole* life was not typical of Christ, so neither were all his words: his suffering and his humiliation first, and his glory afterwards, were faint and passing and evanescent images of the life of Him who was both Son of David and Son of God. But the sorrowful shadow of pollution which passed upon David's life, that was not typical, and, therefore, the words in which it was confessed are not typical or predictive, or capable of application to our Lord."

Leaving the introduction and coming to the treatment of a particular passage bearing nearly on this point, we invite attention to Mr. Perowne's rendering of and annotations on Psalm xvi. 10:—

" 'For thou wilt not leave my soul to the unseen world; thou wilt not suffer thy beloved to see the pit.' Explanatory note.— 'To the unseen world: not as in our version and in that of Luther and others, 'in hell.' The Psalmist says nothing about what shall happen to him *after* death, but is expressing his conviction that God will not leave him to perish, will not give him up to be the prey of the grave, nor suffer him (as follows in the next clause) to see the pit. So too in Acts ii. 27, 'St. Peter says *eis ᾧδου* (or as Lachmann reads, *ᾧδην*). This was still more strikingly true of Christ; for though He died, God did not leave Him to Hades, did not suffer His soul to *remain* there, or His body to rest in the grave.'"

But is not this weak? for David is here represented as wishing not to die: but the further application of the words to Christ, expressive, in His case, of not *remaining* in death, imply an extension of the meaning of the words themselves. St. Peter must have adapted or accommodated them, as the term *διαφθοράν* for *ᾧδου* suggests. Mr. Perowne has a learned note on *ᾧδου*, which, however, does not exhaust the subject; for if the LXX. nearly always give *διαφθοράν* for *ᾧδου*, St. Peter sets his inspired authority to it. He must, then, have seen a more intense force in the Hebrew words than we do, if we follow Mr. Perowne's rendering, as indeed we probably ought. St. Paul is equally explicit in Acts xiii. 36, and both the apostles would seem to exclude David from being a subject of the verse at all. Here is a difficulty that we cannot solve, with our conviction that the terms of

all prophecies are literally applicable to their nearer subject. In his preface to the Psalms Mr. Perowne observes :—"We may still allow a primary and lower reference of the words to David himself without lessening their prophetic import; in some parts even an exclusive reference, for it is not so necessary (and indeed seems scarcely possible) to refer the *whole* Psalm to Christ, because a part of it points to Him."

True, but the dilemma is this: ver. 10 in the Hebrew refers, in Mr. Perowne's version, to David alone. He was evidently, like Hezekiah, anxious to *live*. It would have been unworthy of the apostles to have dwelt on such a truism as that after all David *did* die, and that the full meaning of the words could only be exhausted in Christ. For David was only speaking with reference to the immediate future, and never claimed perpetual life.

Psalm lviii. 9 is thus rendered :—"Before your pots can feel (the fire of) thorns, both green and burning they shall be whirled away." The general sense of this difficult verse seems to be this: As a sudden whirlwind in the desert sweeps away the thorns which have been gathered for cooking, almost as soon as they have been set on fire, and before the caldron has grown hot (comp. Eccles. vii. 6), so shall the wicked, and all their yet uncomplete designs, be swept away by the wrath of God. (For the explanation of the separate words, see Critical Note 1; Explanatory Note.)

Psalm lxviii. 30, "Rebuke the beast of the reed, the herd of bulls, with the calves of the peoples, trampling under foot those that have pleasure in silver. Despise then the peoples that delight in wars." In a footnote, the part trampling is referred to God. This verse is ludicrously rendered by Thrupp in his introduction.

Psalm lxxii. 3, "May he decide the cause of Thy people with righteousness, and of Thine afflicted with judgment." This verse is selected on account of the very excellent explanatory note.

"2. Decide the cause, as in liv. 1, [3.] The word (*dîn*) is a different word from that in ver. 4, rendered 'judge' (*shâphat*). The root of the first signifies *to govern, to rule*; the root of the second, *to be erect, upright*. But both verbs are used in the general sense of *governing*. . . . The main difference between the two, as might be inferred from their respective derivation, is that the first is the more formal and technical word. . . . With respect to the tenses in these verses, to render them as futures, as the English Version and as Hengst. does, is clearly wrong, because at the beginning of verses 8, 16, 17 we have the apocopated forms, which are optatives. We must therefore render all as optatives, or some as optatives, some as conjunctives. Hupfeld and Zunz keep the optative throughout: Ewald has the conjunctive in verses 2, 3."

Psalm xxii. 16 ult., "Piercing my hands and my feet." There is a long, learned and interesting critical note on this clause, the conclusion of which is :—"There can be very little doubt, therefore, that the Masoretic interpretation ought to be given up, especially as 'like a lion' does not suit the context, and leaves the structure of the sentence incomplete. And we are left to follow the versions in rendering either 'piercing, transfixing,' or 'binding my hands and my feet.'"

We are prevented by want of space giving more extracts from a

work which, useful to the scholar and the parish priest, is almost too high pitched in critical tone to be appreciated outside of a limited circle. Less conservative than Thrupp or Phillips, it is as much beyond them in learning as Alford is beyond Bloomfield on the New Testament. But just as Lord Eldon's judgments were marred by excessive doubting, so the very want of strict conservatism will make this work on the Psalms unsatisfactory to many. The author has a standpoint, but many will not discern it, and to many it will appear shifting and uncertain.

The same may be said of Alford's Greek Testament. Few men are inclined to take his *ipse dixit* but all like to cull from the mass of material which he has accumulated, and to glean from his parallel passages.

Mr. Perowne attributes many of the Psalms to David, especially of the first book; one (the seventy-second), probably to Solomon; several to the reigns of Jehoshaphat and Hezekiah, especially the latter; a blank is then left till the return from the captivity. But Jeremiah perhaps wrote Psalm xxxi. and lxxi. Psalm cii. was written towards the close of the seventy years. After the captivity a number of Psalms, chiefly in the fourth and fifth books, were written, and among them the "Songs of Degrees." Psalms cxiii—cxviii., "the Hallel," constituted probably "the hymn" which our Lord and His apostles are said to have sung at his last solemn passover, before he suffered. Mr. Perowne thinks the question of there being *any* Macbean Psalms still an open one.

In conclusion, we may remark that Bishop Colenso's criticisms are examined in nine pages of the volume. We thank Mr. Perowne for this contribution to Biblical science, which from its earnest tone of deep piety will redeem its occasional tendency to give forth an "uncertain sound," and which from its well digested learning will oblige men to think and study hard before they condemn its statements.

---

*The Syntax and Synonyms of the Greek Testament.* By WILLIAM WEBSTER, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

IN our last number we gave a hasty review of this work, expressing generally a high opinion of its merits, but remarking upon several particular matters of detail. We now propose to continue our criticisms more minutely, not with a view of raising a prejudice against a really excellent and useful book, but in hopes that our remarks may be found more or less available in the preparation of a second edition. We feel sure that Mr. Webster will not object to friendly criticism undertaken with such an object, and we should be much grieved if any one were to suppose that we were criticizing this work in any other spirit. It will be seen that we have, as yet, only been able to extend our critical remarks over portions of our subject.

In page 73, *σκεῦη ὀργῆς, ἐλέους, etc.*, are, by a strange confusion, placed under the head of objective genitives, as "vessels which are

objects of wrath, mercy," etc. For these genitives to be objective genitives, the meaning ought to be "vessels exercising wrath," "vessels whose object is wrath." But Mr. Webster exactly inverts the definition of an objective genitive in these cases as compared with his first instance of an objective genitive—*τοῦ ἀνδρὸς εὐμένεια*, goodwill to the man.

In page 100, "Will you come," ought certainly to be, "Shall you come." We do not think Mr. Webster is a Scotchman. We cannot assent to the explanation of the *insertion* (?) of *ἂν* in Luke i. 62, vi. 11, etc., in p. 103. In the *oratio recta*, such of these passages as are in the *oratio obliqua* would severally have run: *τι ἂν θέλοις καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν*; What wouldst thou wish Him to be called? *τί ἂν ποιήσαιμεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*: What can we do to Jesus? In the other passages, the *oratio recta* appears itself, and all of them fall under the ordinary rules of *ἂν* with the optative, *ἂν* being *retained*, not *inserted*, in the *oratio obliqua*. The whole of these passages ought to have been appended to *ἂν* with the optative in the apodosis of conditional prepositions (p. 105), the protasis being idiomatically suppressed.

In page 120, "assuredly" is a singular rendering for *ἀλλὰ*. In every passage quoted but one, "still," or "yet," would give a more vivid translation, and, at the same time, preserve the adversative force of *ἀλλὰ*. That one passage is Rom. vi. 5: "Εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα." It seems to us that there must be a kind of ellipse here, which may be represented by "nay"—"That is not all, but," etc. The language is here very impassioned, so that we may well suppose it to be a little irregular. We know of no exact parallel to this use of *ἀλλὰ*, the passages quoted by Alford (1 Cor. iv. 18, and Hom., *Il.*, i. 81, 82), being utterly irrelevant, and requiring the translation "yet."

On page 122, we would remark that in *τίς ἄρα ῥύσεται, ἄρα* is not an interrogative at all, and the proper translation would be, "who then will save?" And in Gal. ii. 17, we believe that *ἄρα* is not interrogative, but illative, and the passage is in the nature of a *reductio ad impietatem*, horror at which is expressed by *μὴ γένοιτο*. In fact, *ἄρα* is very ill-treated by editors of the New Testament, from whose influence Mr. Webster has not quite got clear.

In page 108, there is a terrible trip in a passage apparently translated from Jacob. *γνώσουσι* is not Greek. It should, we suppose, have been *γνώσκονται*.

In page 109, the use of *τὸ μὴ* with the infinitive is not sufficiently treated; and in page 110, merely the absurd reading, *Τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι*, in 1 Thess. iii. 3, is cited.

In page 110, *ἴσθι ἔχων* is cited from Luke xix. 17, as undoubtedly meaning, "be assured that you have." But, surely, *ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὲν*, in Matt. v. 25, would indicate a very great probability, to say the least, that *ἴσθι* is from *εἰμί*, and not from *οἶδα*.

In page 112, the explanation of Matt. vi. 10, *ὅπως φανώσι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις νηστεύοντες*, is confused, and Mr. Webster has not, in fact,

carried out his own intentions. It should have run, “*νηστεύειν*, etc., would have implied that they may appear to men to fast, without actually doing so.” They would surely not have been “satisfied with the appearance, *even though it was considered to be an outward show*.” Their wish would rather have been to have caused the outward show to have been taken for a reality, and thus have gained the credit without the trouble. But what they actually did was to fast, and take good care to get credit for fasting.

In page 112, again, Dr. Donaldson’s explanation of *τυγχάνω* with a participle ought to have been given, *ἐτυχον παρών*—“I hit the mark in being present,” i. e., “I was just then present.” It is very important that the origin of compound expressions should be explained in a grammar to the New Testament, even though the original force of the component parts taken separately may have vanished.

In page 33, *ἡ παρθένος* (Matt. i. 23) is improperly cited as an instance of the rhetorical use of the article. The phrase occurs in an *actual quotation* from Isaiah vii. 14, where the article occurs also in the Hebrew. No doubt the presence of the article both in the Greek and the Hebrew presents a serious difficulty to commentators, as well as the use of the word *παρ* instead of *παρ* in the Hebrew, which indicates that the prophecy of the *Virgin* parentage of our Lord does not exist in the Hebrew Scriptures, but only in the LXX. Version. But such difficulties ought to be honestly confronted, instead of being met by simple mistranslation, as in the Authorized Version. It does not appear either, that the birth of our Lord from a *virgin* was a matter of previous expectation, although it was a fact. Indeed, such an expectation might have introduced great disorder into social life.

In the same page, it is said, “Sometimes the rhetorical use seems to mark contempt and scorn.” We do not think that the instance cited bears out the statement, viz., Matt. xviii. 17 : *ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης*. To us, the articles here appear simply generic, and indicating classes of persons, with whom disciples, *as such*, would have no intercourse beyond, of course, ordinary matter of business. And we cannot think that our Lord would speak of the class of publicans, from which so many of His disciples came, with *contempt* and *scorn*. In fact, the “rhetorical” use of the article appears to us likely to be with advantage broken up in its component parts, and distributed in their proper places. No doubt the article does occasionally present a certain amount of difficulty, from which a “rhetorical” use offers an easy, although very unphilosophical escape, but such cases would frequently have an idiomatic or local origin which is not easy to trace; and the uses of the article in French and German often present analogies with the Greek article which we do not obtain from our own language.

In page 35, we cannot admit Mr. Webster’s explanation of the article in John iii. 10, *ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, and James ii. 6, *ὁ ἐνὶ τῷ πτωχῷ*. If *ὁ διδάσκαλος* simply means “one who is teacher,” “a teacher,” and *τὸν πτωχόν*, “any one who is poor,” “a poor man,” instead of referring to the *πτωχός* previously mentioned in ver. 2,



we may as well put Donaldson, Winer and Middleton behind the fire at once. In τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, in 2 Cor. xii. 12, the τοῦ is to be explained by the idiomatic tendency of words with the article to require it in the genitives they govern. But the absence of the article in οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου is correctly explained by shewing, as Mr. Webster does, that ἀκροαταὶ νόμου is a compound phrase, to the whole of which the article is prefixed.

In page 119, at the bottom, it should have been said that ἀλλὰ confirms a preceding *negation* rather than a preceding *statement*, and should have been translated "nay" rather than "yea."

In page 121 we scarcely understand how the *weaker ratlocinative* force of ἄρα is said to be supported by the *collective force* of οὖν. We have always considered ἄρα to be somewhat strongly illative, while οὖν indicates resumption or transition.

In page 124 the English proclitic "why" should have been introduced, as being frequently the proper representative of γάρ. Ἄνδρες Ἐφεσίοι, τίς γάρ ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος; "Why, men of Ephesus, who is there?" etc.

In p. 125, the example cited does not prove the assertion that εἰ introduces a statement which is hardly credible. The idea of St. Paul, in Acts xxvi. 8, is, that it is strange that the doctrine of the resurrection should not be believed. But εἰ regularly introduces a thesis or subject for discussion, and Mr. Webster's criticism is, in our opinion, simply a piece of over-refinement; indeed, the passage would have come better under εἰ = ὅτι. In stating that *if* and *εἰ* have really no connection, we presume that Mr. Webster alludes to the supposed origin of *if* from *give*, i. e., *gif*, which often occurs in old writings. This should have been mentioned in the text, or at any rate in a note.

As an interrogative particle, εἰ ought not to have been represented by the Latin *an* and *ne*. *Utrum* is surely its proper equivalent; an alternative is always understood, and no hint is given whether an affirmative or negative answer is to be expected.

In oaths and assertions it is very doubtful whether ζῶ ἐγὼ is to be supplied to εἰ, or whether it is not itself an addition, the real ellipse being, "The Lord do so to me and more also." We feel, however, certain that supplements from the context are in such cases uniformly erroneous.

In p. 126, the alleged use of εἰ μὴ for ἀλλὰ ought rather to be explained from the fact that εἰ μὴ is, with the LXX., the recognized representative of כִּי מִן, just as διαθήκη is of כְּנָח.

Mr. Webster's translation of ἐπεὶ in Heb. ix. 17 by "otherwise" is illogical. "An arrangement by will is valid when men are dead, *otherwise* we can never conceive of its having force, when he who disposed of the property continues alive." Now what can *otherwise* mean, but *in case men are not dead*, which is repeated without the slightest reason in the particular case supposed at the end of the sentence? ἐπεὶ ought surely here to be translated "since," not "otherwise." We need not say that we utterly disagree with the idea that ἰδαθήκη means anything but *covenant* in any passage in the New

Testament, a phrase which is of itself a misnomer, we had almost said, a venerable absurdity.

In page 127 (Heb. x. 2) we should not have expected to find "in" introduced by Mr. Webster in his translation: "Would they not have ceased *in* being offered?" This is probably, however, a mere slip of the pen.

We did not expect to find Mr. Webster quoting with approval the statement of Bishop Ellicott, that the construction with the future is inadmissible with *ἵνα*. It is so, no doubt, in classical Greek, while *ὅπως* is frequently so used; but the instances given by Winer, and still more, those which appear in more recent texts, are too numerous for such an assertion to be maintained for an instant. Ellicott is generally very careful in his grammatical statements, but in this instance he appears to have overshot the mark. The fact seems to be that *ἵνα* had, in Hellenistic Greek, both invaded the province, and in some cases taken the construction of *ὅπως*. Later still it is found with the present indicative. But this citation of Ellicott on the part of Mr. Webster is the more singular, as a few lines higher up the page (129) he had stated that the indicative future after *ἵνα* is probably the correct reading in Gal. ii. 4.

We have already remarked (*J. S. L.* for July, 1864, p. 446) that the Greek Testament exhibits the commencement of the revolution which has in modern Greek entirely substituted *νὰ, ἰ. e., ἵνα*, with the subjunctive for the infinitive. Luke i. 43, *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Κυρίου πρὸς με*, would run in Latin, "unde mihi hoc, ut mater domini ad me venerit." It is a clear Latinism, and Latinisms have not been properly taken into account by grammarians in the New Testament. We have an instance of *ἵνα* and the subjunctive used as an imperative as early as Soph., *Œd. Col.* 155, *ἀλλ' ἵνα τῷδ' ἐν ἀφθέγκτῳ μὴ προσπέσῃς νάπει*.

In page 135 it is a great omission that *εἴγε* is not explained, but merely a caution given that it is not to be confounded with *εἴπερ*. That is, so far as this work goes, to say that an unknown quantity, *εἴγε*, is not to be confounded with a known one, *εἴπερ*. We hope this omission will be supplied in a second edition.

The negative origin and frequent negative signification of *ναὶ*, which is practically acknowledged in page 208, ought to have been noticed in page 135.

In page 136 we cannot see that *νῦν* loses its temporal force in Acts xii. 11, and xxii. 16. It seems to us to be a most emphatic "now" in both passages.

In page 136 *ὅμως* is introduced without hesitation as occurring instead of *ὁμως* in 1 Cor. xiv. 7 and John xii. 42; *ὅμως* is a rare and mostly poetical word, and we doubt whether the readers of Mr. Webster's syntax will find it in any text of the New Testament that they are likely to consult. Something ought surely to have been said in defence of this considerable alteration, or the authority on which it has been made cited.

In page 137 *ὅρα* *εὐελπεῖ* ought surely to have been mentioned as a solecism, though a natural one in the decline of a language. We wonder whether Dr. Wordsworth has been able to discover any "great and solemn truth" to which the singularity of the phrase is designed to call the attention of the reader.

When *ὅτι* is used with forms of solemn asseveration, the formulae are not Greek but Hebraistic. In Rom. viii. 21 we do not see that the different ways of taking *ὅτι* (page 138) make much real difference to the excesses of the passage, though they do to its neatness or awkwardness.

In page 141, *ὑποταγή* in 2 Tim. iii. 25 is surely not equivalent to *εἰρήνη*. Translate: "In meekness instructing those that oppose themselves, [considering] whether God may not (or might not) give them repentance."

In page 142, the change of mood in Thucyd. viii. 47, after *ὅρα*, namely, from the subjunctive to the optative, is surely not identical with that in 1 Thess. iii. 5, from the indicative to the subjunctive. The translation should run: "Lest any how the tempter might have tempted you, and your labour might become in vain." The two passages have nothing whatever in common; this used with the indicative is to be illustrated by the well-known use of *ὅρα* and *ὅτι* with the past indicative, *ὅτι ᾤοντο*, that I might have been blind, and so forth.

In the same page we find: "In the New Testament, the indicative is used to mark the second or remote consequence, while in earlier Greek the subjunctive or optative would have been employed." It should have been the future indicative. *ἂν ἴσῃ* or *εὐέλπῃ* *κατακρινόμενος* *μόλι*.

We also find the popular error, that two or more negatives have the effect of strengthening the negation, repeated. Their rule is, that negatives are attended by compound negatives in preference to other indefinite words. This notion was only gradually rejected from our language, and is still a common vulgarity.

Page 147, last line. (The question of *ὡς* *ἐκ* requires further discussion, and the pleonastic use of *ὡς* in 1 Cor. (2 Cor. v. 19) appears to us to militate against it.)

We have now occupied as much space as can fairly be claimed by our subject, and we bid Mr. Webster farewell with the hope that some of our criticisms may be found not unavailable for a second edition of his useful work, at which we heartily wish it may ere long arrive.

*The first twelve chapters of the Gospel according to St. Matthew in the uncorrected Greek Text. With various readings and notes, critical and exegetical.* By the late Rev. J. FORSHALL, M.A., F.R.S. London: Macmillan and Co.

This may be viewed either as a fragment or as a specimen of a work which its learned editor did not live to complete. Mr. Forshall was long connected with the British Museum, where he distinguished himself by qualities, accomplishments, and labours, which won for him an honourable name. At the close of his life almost he projected the

any rate issued, the prospectus of an edition of the *Received Text of the New Testament*, but he was called away while his task was incomplete. His son has, however, published that portion which was most advanced, consisting of only twelve chapters of the first Gospel, and of even these the notes are not all what they would have been. But, notwithstanding all the disadvantages under which they have been issued, these pages are interesting and instructive. If we regret, as we do, the decree by which the editor was removed, we are glad to have this example of his mode of illustrating the sacred text. He puts in the margin the readings which he prefers to those of the received text, and places in footnotes his observations both critical and expository, along with references to the readings of important MSS., and of editors, as well as of ancient versions. The text is divided into sections, the contents and subjects of which are indicated. The alterations proposed to be made in the received text are very few, but they are generally appropriate. It is proposed even to retain the doxology in Matt. vi. 13, and it must be admitted that, notwithstanding the absence of it in some important authorities, much may be said in its favour. If numbers are to decide, the doxology must not be omitted, and as for antiquity, it can at least be said that it is found in the oldest known version, the Peshito Syriac. We are less certain as to the propriety of altering the received text in chap. vii. 14, so as to read *τί στενή*, for *ὅτι στενή*; because, although numbers may be pleaded in its favour, the most weighty evidence seems to be against it. Still it is a very ancient reading, and not lightly to be neglected.

Without committing ourselves to all the principles upon which Mr. Forshall has proceeded, we think there are few students of the Greek New Testament who will not regard this fragment as worthy of attention, and few who may not derive from it some hints which will be valuable to them. Probably the prevailing tendency of our principal critics is to attach too exclusive importance to the uncial MSS. To a great extent we sympathize with this tendency, but we believe those are to be heard who claim a respectful hearing for the cursives.

Let us express the hope that some one who is competent for the work, will undertake and execute a task similar to that which Mr. Forshall projected. His plan is illustrated and explained by the specimen now before us, and if it leads to a practical result similar to that we have named, he will not have thought and laboured in vain.

---

*Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis.* Being an exact copy, in ordinary type, of the celebrated Uncial Græco-Latin manuscript of the four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles, written in the sixth century, and presented to the University of Cambridge by Theodore Beza, A.D. 1581. Edited with a Critical Introduction, Annotations, and Facsimiles, by FREDERICK H. SCRIVENER, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy.

HERE we have another of the great uncials of the New Testament in small type, and of a convenient size for reference. Those of us who

know the Codex D, as it appears in the noble edition of Kipling, whatever our love for facsimile characters, will none the less be delighted to see the MS. reproduced line for line and letter for letter, in a form so commodious. The volumes of Kipling are ponderous and expensive, and fitted for the libraries of public institutions and the wealthy, more than for the private possession of ordinary students, who, like poets, often have to sigh over the *res angustæ domi*, and the narrowness of their house as well. We, therefore, rejoice on various accounts that the Cambridge MS. has been edited as we now see it, by so careful and experienced a scholar as Mr. Scrivener, whose long familiarity with manuscripts, and habits of close observation, eminently fit him for such a work.

We shall at present not do much more than describe this very well-edited and beautifully printed volume. It is dedicated to Dr. E. H. Browne (Bishop of Ely). Following the dedication is the Latin letter which Beza wrote when he presented the MS. to Cambridge, and also a letter addressed to him in acknowledgment. The introduction opens with a short notice of Codex D, and of this edition, and then proceeds to details. Chap. 1. On the recent history of the Codex. 2. On the palæographical appearance of the Codex; its probable origin and date. 3. On the Latin version in this Codex. 4. On the character of the Greek text. The text is printed in double columns, the Greek on the left, and the Latin on the right, and, as we have said, line for line and letter for letter with the original. Words are separated, but modern accents, etc., have been judiciously omitted. Those portions of the text which are ascribed to a later hand are relegated to the appendix. After these come the editorial notations of corrections made in the MS., and some other matters necessary for the perfect appreciation of the MS., and of what he has done.

The Codex is well known as one of the chief treasures of the University of Cambridge. It is remarkable as a book, so much so that its external appearance distinguishes it from nearly, or quite, all other MSS. It is remarkable for its contents, which include the Latin as well as the Greek of the Gospels and Acts. It is remarkable for its arrangement—Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts. It is remarkable for its readings, both in the Greek and in the Latin. If it can claim, as Mr. Scrivener believes, to have been written in the sixth century, the MS. has high antiquity as a title to honour. Those who have not the privilege of access to it, may form a very good idea of the appearance and style of its writing by consulting the beautiful facsimiles which Mr. Scrivener has inserted in his edition.

It appears that this MS. passed from Italy into France, and was obtained at Lyons in 1562, during the civil wars between the Catholics and Protestants at that time. Beza, its fortunate possessor, made a present of it to Cambridge, as already noticed. Mr. Scrivener gives an account of collations, transcript, etc., beginning with R. Stephens in 1550.

The MS. is imperfect; of 534 leaves 406 survive, containing all

Luke, and most of the other three Gospels, the Acts, and the Latin of the last four verses and a half of 3 John, preceding the Acts. A few portions which were lost have been supplied by a more recent hand. The Greek and Latin are on alternate pages, and are stichometrically written: There is a general resemblance between the Greek and Latin characters which is peculiar and striking; and they are respectively peculiar as compared with other writings in the same languages. The Ammonian sections, and some other minutiae, are supposed to have been introduced into the MS. long after it was written, by no fewer than ten or twelve correctors, etc., etc. Of all these matters Mr. Scrivener gives a careful, lucid, and detailed account in his introduction. We add that he considers Gaul to have been the native country of the MS. and of the Latin version.

The text of both the Greek and the Latin exhibits so many peculiarities that, on this account alone, it ought to be studied, and we would say collated with the received text, by all who take an interest in the state of the text of the New Testament. Mr. Scrivener's summary of the features of the MS. and of the two texts is admirable, and we feel that no abstract can supersede the necessity of reading what he says. In his texts he adds to and corrects the edition of Kipphing, and thus everything has been done which could be desired to give to students all the help they can require for the satisfactory use of this precious document.

For ordinary readers who may not have seen the work in any form, we extract a few verses from the Latin translation, which we print as it stands in Mr. Scrivener's edition. The passage we select is chosen simply because it gives the disputed narrative of the adulterous woman:

"responderunt et dixerunt ei: num quid et tu de  
de galilaea es? scribitur et uide scripturas  
quoniam propheta de galilaea  
non surgit et abiit  
unusquisque in domum suam. Ihs autem abiit  
in montem oliuarum: mane autem  
eorum venit in templum  
et omnis populus coniebat ad eum  
adducunt autem scribae et pharisaei  
in peccato muliere mulierem conprehensam  
et statuentes eam in medio  
dicunt illi temptantes eum sacerdotes ut haberent  
accusare eam: magister haec mulier  
conprehensa est palam in adulterio  
moyses autem in lege praecepit tales  
lapidare: tu autem nunc quid dicis  
Ihs autem inclinatus digito suo scribebat  
in terram cum autem inuaderent interrogantes  
eum: et dixit illis quis est sine peccato  
nostrum prior super eam mittat lapidem  
et iterum inclinatus digito super  
scribebat in terram: unusquisque autem  
iudeorum exiebat incipientes  
a presbyteris et omnes exire  
et remansit solus: et mulier in medio cum esset

Erigena autem se ipsa dixit mulieri  
ubi sunt nemo te condemnavit  
ad illa dixit illi nemo dme  
ad ille dixit nec ego te condemno  
nada et ex hoc iam non peccare  
iterum ergo loquebatur ad illos dicens  
ego sum lux mundi qui me sequitur  
non ambulavit in tenebris. John, vii. 52, viii. 12. notes T. 1800  
The Texts of the most ancient Manuscripts of the Greek Testament  
arranged in parallel order, with a collation of the Sinaitic Manuscript.  
By HOWARD H. HANSELL, Professor of Theology, Magdalen College, Oxford. Three Vols. 8vo. Oxford: 1864.

The object of this truly valuable work is to render the texts of the earliest MSS. of the New Testament more available for general use than they have hitherto been. It is now two hundred years ago since the idea of such a work was first started by the learned Mill—an edition of the Greek Testament *quæ una pagina et in uno conspectu codicem Alex. et Cantabrig. etc., representet*. And now at last it has been published to the world in a form and manner which leaves little to desire. The plan adopted by Mr. Hansell may be thus stated: The text of the Gospels is printed in four parallel columns, from the Codex Alexandrinus (A), the Codex Vaticanus, 1209 (B), the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C), the Codex Bezae (D). As the Codex Alexandrinus is unfortunately deficient up to Matt. xxv. 6, the lacuna has been supplied from the Codex Dublinensis Rescriptus (Z), the remaining portions of this MS., which is but fragmentary, being arranged in a fifth division running under the other four, after the point where A begins. A similar arrangement is also adopted in the Acts, where besides the texts of A, B, C, D, the work gives also the text of the Codex Laudianus (E).

The text of the Catholic Epistles, which follow the Acts, is also given in three columns from A, B, C. That of the Pauline Epistles is given in four parallel columns, from A, B, C, and the Codex Claromontanus. In the Apocalypse three texts are given—those of A, C, and that of the Codex Vaticanus 2086 (not the famous Vatican MS., which is deficient in this book).

The character used is very properly the cursive, the words are divided as in the common Greek Testaments, instead of running one into another, as is the case in all the ancient codices; contractions are not given in the text, but always in the notes.

The numerous corrections by different hands which disfigure all the ancient MSS. presented a great difficulty to the editor. The plan he has adopted is as follows: Wherever the reading of the *prima manus* could be ascertained this is always given in the text, where this was impracticable the corrected reading is given in thick type, the probable or possible reading being always added in the notes. Originally Mr. Hansell designed to print the readings of the *prima manus* alone, adding occasionally the corrections of later hands. As the work proceeded,

however, he tells us he became more and more convinced of the desirableness of giving *all* the corrections of subsequent scribes, and this he has accordingly done in the notes.

One feature of the work, which adds greatly to its value, is the plan of pointing out in every case the variations from the *textus receptus*. The omission of a word or words found in the text of our common Greek Testament is indicated by the mark †. The addition of a word or phrase is denoted thus ||. Where the ancient text exhibits a reading varying from our common text, the sign † appraises the reader of the fact. Transpositions are indicated by the mark §. The labour incurred in the execution of this plan by the editor can scarcely be conceived by those who have never been similarly engaged; but the value of the work to the Biblical scholar is thus immensely increased.

The reader who for the first time compares, with the aid of this parallel edition, the texts of the most ancient MSS. with that of our common Greek Testament will be greatly surprised at the often wide discrepancies with which he meets. The frequent omissions of words, phrases, and sometimes of a whole verse, by the celebrated Vatican Codex, will awaken great astonishment in such as have been accustomed to regard the purity of the text of Greek manuscripts as in a direct ratio with their antiquity. And then another of the four codices of the gospels printed by Mr. Hansell is equally remarkable for its *additions*. We refer to the Codex Bezae. In the Acts especially, it is surprising how frequently we find the text interpolated by the officious scribe. We give the following specimens of the additions of the MS. The interpolated matter is given within brackets.

Acts, chap. i. 5. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost, [and which ye are about to receive]."  
 ii. 1. "And [it came to pass in those days] of the complete fulfilment of the day of Pentecost."

iv. 24. "And when they heard that [and recognized the power of God]."

iv. 26. "And spake the word with boldness [to every one who was willing to believe]."

v. 15. At the end of this verse the MS. adds: [for they were delivered from every infirmity, as each of them received it].

v. 18. At the end, the MS. adds: [and each one proceeded to his own place].

v. 39. "Ye cannot overthrow it, [neither you, nor kings, nor tyrants; therefore, refrain from these men]."

xi. 1. "And it became known to the apostles, and to the brethren who were in Judaea, that the Gentiles had received the word of God. Peter, therefore, after some time, wished [to proceed to Jerusalem; and when he had informed the brethren and strengthened them, discoursing much in the countries, teaching them who also opposed them, and announced to them the grace of God.]"

xi. 27. "And in these days came prophets from Jerusalem and Antioch; and there was great rejoicing of us who had been converted]."



xii. 10. "And going forth, [they went down seven steps] and passed on through one street," etc.

xiii. 43. The MS. adds, at the close of the verse: [And it came to pass that the word of God spread through the whole city].

xv. 5. The MS. reads thus: ["But they who exhorted them to go up to the elders rose up,] saying," etc.

xv. 12. ["And the elders having approved of the things said by Peter,] all the multitude kept silence," etc.

xvi. 4. "And passing through the cities, [they preached and declared to them, with all boldness, the Lord Jesus Christ, at the same time,] delivering [to them] the decrees of the apostles," etc.

xvi. 35. "And when it was day, the magistrates [came together to the market-place, and recollecting the earthquake that had happened, were afraid, and] sent the sergeants, saying, Let those men go [which thou didst yesterday lay hold of.]"

xvi. 39. "And having gone [to the prison, with many friends,] they besought them to go forth [saying, We were ignorant of this about you, that you were innocent men,] and leading them forth, they exhorted them, saying, Go away from this city, [lest again they assemble tumultuously to us, crying out against you.]"

xvii. 15. After the word "Athens," the MS. inserts, ["And he passed through Thessaly, for he was prevented from preaching the Word unto them.]"

xviii. 6. ["And when much discourse had taken place, and the Scriptures had been interpreted,] and they opposed," etc.

xviii. 27. The MS. reads thus: ["And at Ephesus, certain Corinthians having arrived and heard him, entreated him to go with them, into their country, and when he assented,] the Ephesians wrote," etc.

xix. 1. "And when Paul was resolved, according to his own purpose, to proceed to Jerusalem, the Spirit spoke to him to turn aside into Asia,] and having passed through," etc.

Such are some of the extraordinary additions to the text contained in the highly-prized Codex Bezae. We have only given the more important interpolations, as far as the commencement of the nineteenth chapter. The Codex is very defective in the latter book of the book. Well might Davidson say of this most ancient MS.: "The text of this MS. is peculiar. Its interpolations are numerous and considerable. It is full of arbitrary glosses and mistakes, especially in the Acts. In this respect, no other MS. can be compared with it. Its singularly corrupt text, in connection with its great antiquity, is a curious problem, which cannot easily be solved." (*Bib. Crit.*, ii, p. 288.)

There can be little doubt that the work before us will give a fresh impulse to the study of textual criticism in this country. The increased facilities, too, which it will afford for the investigation of the peculiar characteristics of the most ancient uncial MSS. will infallibly lead to juster notions of their value. Hitherto it has been too often taken for granted, that the value of a Greek MS. is in direct proportion to its date, as though a cursive MS. of the tenth or eleventh century

were, as a matter of course, inferior in authority to that of an uncial two or three centuries older. No doubt the presumption *ceteris paribus*, is in favour of the older copy, but it ought not to be taken as a settled fact—still less ought the cursive MSS. to be quite left out of view in deciding a reading. Certainly, the numerous instances of omission in the Vatican MS., and those of addition in the Codex Bezae, are not likely to impress the reader with a very favourable opinion of what is called “ancient authority;” and it is a remarkable fact that the critical editions of Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, quote more frequently than any others those two codices as the ground of their omitting clause after clause from the text of the Greek Testament. The motto of Lachmann is still followed: “Ante omnia antiquissimorum rationem habebimus. sed certe constituto rectione, ita leues et corruptas recusabimus.”

*The Divine Plan of Revelation: an Argument from Internal Evidence in support of the structural unity of the Bible.* Being the Boyle Lectures for 1864. By the Rev. EDWARD GARRETT, M.A. London: Hamilton, Adams, and Co. 1864.

This is the third series of Boyle Lectures delivered by Mr. Garrett. The first of these was published under the title of *The Bible and its Critics*; the second on *The Conflict between Science and Infidelity*, is still unpublished; and the third is that before us, to which we must confine our attention. It has prefixed to it an analytical table of contents, which will enable any one to see at once what topics are treated, or to find anything he is in search of. The Lectures are eight in number, and we shall rapidly indicate their titles and subjects, simply requesting the reader not to forget that the eight lectures are branches of one great argument to prove the Bible an organic whole,—to know in fact, from the evidences of design and co-ordination in the Bible, that it is the work of one author, itself one by its structural unity. The *a posteriori* argument in religion is an old one, and notwithstanding the outcry raised against it by its opposers, and the concessions made by its friends, it will always be popular and useful. It has the merit of inspired authority, and may be found in the Old and New Testaments alike. Thus to give but one instance, St. Paul not obscurely refers to it when he says, “Every house is built by some man, but he that built all things is God” (Heb. iii. 4). Now if the Bible reveals an unmistakeable plan, and is constructed after a uniform design, it will be easy to infer that it had an architect; and that this architect must have been God.

The first lecture is headed “Evidences of Design,” and is a very masterly statement of the argument. The author shows that Christians always have maintained, and must maintain, the structural unity of the Bible, while modern rationalists affirm its fragmentary character. He fairly and clearly states the reasons for both lines of reasoning, their results, and the objections to the rationalistic plan. He also sets forth the general proofs of design as seen in the Bible.

Having thus prepared the way for the more direct treatment of the subject, the author proceeds to give us in his second lecture the "Outlines of the Divine Plan." The purpose of God in regard to man is here shewn to have been one of mercy and salvation. This purpose involved, 1, a revelation; 2, moral probation; 3, a work of preparation; 4, an elect nation; and 5, an example of the dealings of Divine Providence. All these conditions are illustrated by the Bible.

The third lecture is on "The Plan on its human side." Man's necessities, and his mental and moral capabilities, must have had an influence in determining the character and mode of revelation. To be effectual a revelation must be made in human language, and by human instrumentality. But this very condition rendered possible unbelief and disobedience. But the divine purpose had to be accomplished, and was accomplished, although the variations of human conduct required corresponding variations in God's dealings at different times.

The plan, which thus presents both a divine side and a human side, was historically developed and to this historic development the author now applies himself. Lecture iv., "The Pre-Mosaic Period," treats of the earlier revelations to our race as exhibited in the Book of Genesis. Of the position of this book, and of other circumstances in connection with it, we have an able discussion. We particularly call attention to the reasoning designed to prove that the Book of Genesis was meant to teach religious truth, and not science nor secular history. Pursuing the historical order, the author, in his fifth lecture, treats of the "Period of the Law," the sixth of the "Period of the Kingdom;" and the seventh, of the "Times of the Gospel." There is not in these lectures the brilliancy of treatment, the fulness of detail, and the local colouring which give such a charm to Dean Stanley's *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, but there is a sober, earnest, reverent, and decided tone in them, which cannot fail to have a most beneficial effect. This is not all, for, high as we would fix the author's moral and spiritual qualities, we would not forget to commend his free and forcible style, his command of Scripture knowledge, his general information, and his well disciplined and refined intellect. It follows necessarily from the wide range of topics which come under review, that some of them are not treated so fully as we could desire; but it is to be borne in mind that lectures are lectures after all, and that in preparing them a process of condensation has to be carried on, which is often difficult and unwelcome. However, notwithstanding the obstacles in his way, Mr. Garbett has, in his four historical lectures, presented us with a comprehensive survey of Scripture, interspersed with varied reasonings and illustrations, such as we have seldom met with; in many respects indeed we know nothing with which to institute a comparison. We hardly know which of the lectures to commend most, but we should think the seventh, on the Times of the Gospel, as striking as any for its originality and practical utility.

The eighth lecture is entitled "God's Word written," but it comprises recapitulations of facts already stated, reasonings upon them,

and a number of important observations. The conclusion arrived at is that the Scriptures are characterized by the unity spoken of at the outset, and that they were given by inspiration in accordance with the divine purpose; that they are, in fact, God's Word written. We have no doubt whatever that the author has demonstrated the moral and intellectual unity of the Bible, that amid the differences of form, agency and outward circumstances in which it was given, there is a doctrinal unity, a unity of intention and of adaptation, of spirit and of doctrine, which finds no parallel, and which can only be accounted for on the theory that it was given by inspiration of God. Although fifteen hundred years elapsed between the composition of the first and the last books of Scripture, they form a homogeneous whole. We are forcibly reminded of a remarkable passage where we read of "The foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone, in whom all the building, fully framed together groweth unto a holy temple in the Lord" (Eph. ii. 20, 21). In the Bible, as elsewhere, there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are differences of administrations, but the same Lord; and there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all" (1 Cor. xii. 4-6). We therefore accept the Bible as an expression of the manifold wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 10) whereby God at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets."

Mr. Garbett merits our grateful thanks for the way in which he has shewn how the unity of the whole appears amid the diversity of the details of the Bible; how, in fact, the book of revelation is like the book of nature and the work of God for the same reason. "Unity in diversity" is the great law alike in nature, providence, and grace, and not less so in the Bible. Henceforth we trust Christians will make the same use of the argument from design in proving the divine origin of the Bible, as they have in proving the divine origin of the world. The narrow limits within which we are confined prevent us from indicating many of the most valuable parts of this work: from commenting upon such details as appear to require further consideration; and from giving extracts. But we feel sure that those who are induced to read the volume by our commendation, will share in our satisfaction, and will similarly obtain many hints of real value. The battle is about the Bible, and if it is the duty of every one to contribute his utmost to the settlement of the great questions in debate, it is no less our duty to make ourselves acquainted with what has been already done by the leading spirits of the age, on the side of orthodoxy as well as on that of rationalism.

*The argument of St. Paul's epistle to the Christians in Rome traced and illustrated.* By the Rev. C. P. SHEPHERD, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy.

These two volumes contain fifty-two sermons on the Epistle to the

Romans, and some supplemental matter. In a somewhat popular style, as might be expected in sermons actually preached, but with much clearness, the author presents us with a commentary upon a most important portion of Holy Scripture. Earnestly, reverently, and religiously he prosecutes his task, and the result is a really valuable contribution to our expository literature. Necessarily restricted in the use of technical phraseology, the author has yet carefully weighed and investigated all the difficulties of the Epistle to the Romans, and developed its meaning and application in language which is often striking and forcible. As a faithful minister of God's word, the preacher endeavours to set forth the whole meaning of the apostle without avoiding or softening down the strong truths which he teaches. At the same time, his theology does not go the length of many of the Calvinistic school; probably he would not wish it described as even moderate Calvinism; but it is more like that in many of its phases than it is like the Arminianism which some teach. His comparative freedom from party prejudices enables him to give a common-sense explanation of certain passages that are almost invariably misunderstood. As a single example, we note the words quoted by St. Paul from Malachi: "Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated." It is obvious, he says, to any one who will take the trouble to look into the passage of the prophet, that he is not speaking of the individual men, Esau and Jacob, but of the two nations, Edom and Israel. Yet, obvious as this is, how few there are who ever made this observation! We should not accept of every explanation given, but where there is so much to commend, and such proof that the author reads with open eyes, we cannot withhold our hearty approval of his work, and the expression of our hope that it will find many readers.

*The complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D.* Edited with Memoirs by the Rev. A. B. Grosart. Vol. VII., containing Miscellaneous Sermons, Indexed, &c. Edinburgh: James Nichol & Co. 1880.

*The complete Works of Stephen Charnock, B.D.* With Introduction, by the Rev. James M. Cosh, LL.D. Vol. I., containing Discourses on Divine Providence, and the Existence and Attributes of God. Edinburgh: James Nichol & Co. 1880.

We congratulate all the parties concerned on the completion of Dr. Sibbes' works. The enterprise of the publisher, and the zeal of the editor, have given the subscribers an edition of Dr. Sibbes which throws into the shade all previous editions; in fact, this is the first collection deserving the name of "complete." We have already expressed our opinion of this important series in general, and of Dr. Sibbes in particular, and we do not know that we can add much upon either point. We shall, however, refer to Mr. Grosart's estimate of Dr. Sibbes. "The author," he says, "gives forth no 'uncertain sound,' but definitely, yet most catholically, scripturally yet most charitably expresses his 'opinions,' which all bear the stamp of convictions. He was a Puritan in 'doctrine,' but loyal to the Church of England with that

touching loyalty shewn to the throne by illustrious contemporaries; even when they despised its occupant. On almost every point of theology, the works of Richard Sibbes will rarely be consulted, in vain. They are a casket of gems, and the lid needs but to be raised to flash forth wealth of spiritual thought." He thinks Sibbes specially merits the title of "heavenly," because of the goodness which dwelt in him and appears in his works. He does not claim for Sibbes the title of "great" in the world's meaning, and when compared with some other men. So far well; but perhaps the greatness of goodness, of heavenly-mindedness, of holy words as well as of holy thoughts, of holy aims as well as of a holy life, is not the form of greatness which we should least covet or honour. For ourselves, Richard Sibbes endeared himself to us in the earliest days of our Christian pilgrimage, and this may be partly why he is such a favourite of ours; but we see clearly enough that the value we set upon his writings is that which has been set on them by many more for over two hundred years.

The valuable indexes, etc., appended to this last volume of Sibbes are, 1. Bibliographical list of his works; 2. Glossary; 3. Names quoted or referred to; 4. General index; 5. Texts.

Not having any horror of such words as "Puritan," "Calvinistic," any more than we have of some others, but speaking of Dr. Sibbes as we find him, we have much real pleasure in urging the lovers of sound Christian and scriptural teaching to familiarize themselves with his books if they have not done so already.

The second work noted above is the first volume of Stephen Charnock's writings. There are still surviving some of the old school who have been wont to regard Charnock as one of the giants of his time. Charnock was born in London in 1628, and died in 1680. An interesting memoir of him is given by Dr. M'Cosh, and to that we must refer for the details of this life and character. From the same pen we have some observations on the Puritan preaching and the Puritan lectures, and also upon the philosophical principles involved in the Puritan theology. This last section is at once curious and valuable.

Charnock's own works contained in this volume are worthy of the study of thoughtful men. The discourse on Providence is a very able dissertation upon a question of abiding importance. The series of discourses upon the Existence and Attributes of God displays profound thought, extensive knowledge of Scripture, and the fruits of great reading. Charnock handles his themes with a master's skill, and in a becoming spirit of reverence, and we can quite understand why this work especially has been esteemed so highly. He quotes Hebrew occasionally, as well as Greek and Latin, but we are sorry to observe that the Hebrew is badly printed. The English letter-press seems to be accurately done. The editor also appears to do his work conscientiously.

Arrangements are announced for the issue of a supplemental series of miscellaneous commentaries, by eminent Puritans. We are glad of this, and hope the idea will be an additional attraction to subscribers, as

it will certainly enable the conductors to represent more completely the style and manners of the old Puritan divines. We can partly account for the neglect into which have fallen so many of the theological writers of the century which elapsed from Elizabeth's accession to Cromwell's death, but we cannot wholly explain it. Doubtless they were many, perhaps most of them what we should call Calvinists; another feature in their character was their intense religiousness, besides which, their style of writing was not so free, easy, and elegant, as less earnest times required. It is natural to suppose that in an age like that of the second Charles, they would be neglected or despised, except by a constantly diminishing minority; and from this neglect and despite they have not recovered. Notwithstanding their acknowledged imperfections, and that they are especially not on a level with the criticism of our day, they have a value which time cannot diminish, and for the purposes of practical soul religion will never be surpassed. They are the true "Fathers" of English Protestantism, and we hope the series of Mr. Nichol and his colleagues will do much to restore them to due honour.

**A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, arranged with reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the use of English Students.** By MONIER WILLIAMS, M.A., Boden Professor of

Sanskrit in the University of Oxford, etc. Third Edition, much enlarged and improved. London: Macmillan and Co. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

The learned author of this admirable work says, "In putting forth this third edition of my *Sanskrit Grammar*, I am bound to confess that the great general development of Sanskrit learning since the last edition has compelled me almost to re-write the work for the third time. Any one who compares the present grammar with its predecessor will see at once the difference between the two, not indeed in its structure and arrangement, nor even in the numbering of the rules, but in the fuller and more complete explanation of points of detail." So very distinct a statement renders it unnecessary for us to attempt any comparison of the present and preceding editions. We are glad, however, that this eminent Sanskritist has sought to bring up his work to the level of the scholarship of the day. Whether he has done this must be decided by the masters of the language; but, in the meantime, we have no difficulty in expressing our admiration alike of the plan and of the details of the work.

Such a work may fulfil two very different but important functions. We have a vast Indian empire, and within its limits we not only find the venerable and wonderful stratum of Sanskrit literature, but modern derivations from the language in a number of living dialects spoken by many millions. Unquestionably a knowledge of Sanskrit is of great importance to the lords of India; without it we cannot thoroughly understand the country which Providence has given us to govern, and with it, it becomes more easy to communicate to the natives our civil



social, and religious ideas. On political and religious, as well as on literary grounds, it is of enormous consequence to us whether we neglect or attend to the Sanskrit. The grammar of Professor Williams, therefore, supplies us with a stepping stone to learning with which we cannot dispense in our actual relations to India. This is the first great work such a book has to do. The second is not of small moment. The study of comparative philology shews not only the derivation of sundry great Indian dialects from the Sanskrit, but has established the kinship of Sanskrit with "Greek, Latin, Persian, Gothic, Lithuanian, Slavonic, Keltic, and through some of these, with Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and our own mother-tongue." Startling as this fact may appear, it is established on a basis which cannot be shaken; and it leads us to the conclusion that all the nations thus joined in speech are of one blood; that, however different externally, and in details, they have radiated from a common centre, or sprung from a common stock. Now even the study of a Sanskrit grammar without the reading of a Sanskrit book, will enable the philologist to illustrate, amplify, and verify the conclusions which others have arrived at. With such assistance as Professor Williams supplies, any one may see for himself whether he has been truly informed or not, and he may make himself familiar with the principles on which identifications are based.

Of the uses of Sanskrit literature we do not now speak, but that literature is of exceeding interest, and full of instruction to him who would study the history of religion and of philosophy, and such other departments of human activity as are represented in Sanskrit books. In the single domain of mythology, incalculable service is rendered by this literature, because of the relations which it reveals between the classical systems of Greece and those of the far East. With every desire not to exaggerate, we should find it difficult to describe in too strong terms the possible results of a complete investigation of the whole range of existing Sanskrit literature, and a complete collation of it with other ancient literatures.

It is not possible in these pages to give any detailed account of Professor Williams's new grammar. It starts at the simplest elements, and leads on the learner by successive steps through all the variations which letters and words undergo; it contains a chapter on the syntax, exercises in translation and parsing, and some account of metres; an English index, and another in Sanskrit, form a useful appendix for reference. We do not say the student can require nothing beyond what is here offered him, but we believe the excellence of the plan, the transparency of the rules, and the fulness of the illustrations are such, that he must be obtuse who does not by their means lay a broad and firm foundation. It affords us pleasure, however, to embrace this opportunity of mentioning the *Sanskrit Manual*, by the same author, a little book, containing, Part I., the Accidence of Grammar, chiefly in Roman or English type; Part II., a complete series of progressive exercises. (London: W. H. Allen and Co.) It is not for us to



usurp the functions of the Sanskrit teacher, but we strongly advise all young students to use both these works, and not merely one. We like the idea of two books in learning a language—a greater grammatical *Atheas*, and a lesser "*fidus Achates*."

The new edition of the grammar extends to beyond 400 octavo pages, and is a beautiful specimen of printing. It is another proof that the Oxford press need not fear to compete with any press in Europe. As for the Sanskrit type, its features, as we may term them, commend themselves to our English eyes as preferable to some of the continental founts.

An index of Greek and Latin words, etc., compared with Sanskrit, would have been an attraction to some, whether acquainted with Dopp or not.

*The Book of Job*; translated from the Hebrew. By Rev. J. M. Rodwell, M.A. London: Williams and Norgate.

Mr. Rodwell has won for himself an honourable place among the Shemite scholars of this country. His new arrangement and translation of the Koran proves his acquaintance with the Arabic. Our own pages have been often enriched with his versions from the Ethiopic; and now we receive a translation from the Hebrew of that very difficult book—the Book of Job. We have sciolists among us who pretend to know every acre of the domain of learning from Dan to Beersheba, and they often persuade men to believe them, and so do more or less of mischief. But while philological quackery is as common and as practicable as any other kind of quackery, we have ripe and able scholars of whom we may say, "Wisdom is justified of her children." We regard the book before us as highly creditable to the learning and skill of its author, who has carefully investigated and clearly stated the sense of the work which he has translated. Proceeding upon sound philological principles, he has produced a thoroughly independent version of Job, and has thus supplied us with an important help to its right interpretation. He has not entered upon the task of a theologian or of a commentator, but has confined himself to the expression of the literal sense.

There is a brief introduction in which Mr. Rodwell states his opinions as to the age and intention of the Book of Job. Its age, he thinks, is the period between Solomon's reign and the exile. Its object is, according to him, the discussion of the old problem—"the consistency of the prosperity of the wicked, and the depression and afflictions of the good with the world's 'righteous government on the part of the Father and Maker of all.'"

The poetical portions of the book are printed in parallelisms, with no division into chapters and verses, which are merely indicated in a general way at the top of the page. The notes are few and brief, indicative of other possible renderings, and explanatory of certain allusions, or occasionally referring to the old versions, etc. Nothing like a commentary has been attempted.

The phraseology is, in general, the current English of our own day, but certain words, as *Eloah*, *Shaddai*, and some other names, have been printed as they stand in the Hebrew original. We have tested some of the renderings, and have generally been able to accept them, but we confess that we are in doubt occasionally. The famous passage, chap. xix. 25—27, "For I know that my Redeemer liveth," etc., is thus translated:—"That I know my *Goel* lives, and that He shall arise, the last upon the earth. Yes, after my skin has thus been pierced, even in my flesh shall I see *Eloah*, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not those of another. For *Him* my reins pine away within me." Upon the word "*Goel*," we have this note, "Blood-avenger, Vindicator; i. e., God will vindicate me soon upon this very earth, though ye all fail and persecute me, and will restore me."

We cannot say that we should have translated the above passage in exactly the same manner. Without saying we are necessarily correct, and without pretending to produce an elegant version, the passage seems to us to say—as literally as we can express it—"And I, I know my *Goel* liveth, and hereafter (or, the last) shall arise upon the dust. And after my skin they break down this,—even out of my flesh I shall see *Eloah*, whom I, I shall see for myself, and my eyes behold, and not a stranger: my reins are consumed within me." Many explanations of this abrupt and broken utterance are possible, but none can dispense with the insertion of words not in the text, nor with more or less of paraphrase. Some of the Hebrew words, moreover, are so far ambiguous that it is a question what English equivalents should be adopted. Might we not represent the passage thus? "As for me, I know my Avenger liveth, and will hereafter stand up [or He who is hereafter (i. e., the last) will arise, in the arena to contend for me. Though after my skin they crush this whole frame, even yet out of my body I shall see *Eloah*, whom I myself shall see for myself, and my own eyes look upon, and not a stranger's: meanwhile my reins (i. e., heart) are consumed within me." A reference to the ancient versions leads to the suspicion that here, as frequently elsewhere, some of them follow readings of the original which we do not possess; at any rate, they differ exceedingly on some points from any practicable translation of our Hebrew copies.

We are glad to find the version of Mr. Rodwell free from many of the traditional and uncritical renderings of the authorized translation. Chapter xxii. 30 is an example. Nothing can be more absurd than what we are here called on to believe; "He shall deliver the island of the innocent, or (as in the margin) the innocent shall deliver the island." The true translation, given us by Mr. Rodwell, is: "Even him who is not guiltless shall He deliver." We only mention one case in which a Rabbinical conceit eagerly adopted by some moderns has not been received into the text: "And shall multiply my days like the sand." So Mr. Rodwell, at chap. xxix. 18, as in our version; but still he refers to the other rendering of *phariz* for *sand*.

Considering the immense difficulty of the work he has had to do, and fully convinced that it is impossible to give more than a provisional translation of a number of passages in Job, we congratulate Mr. Rodwell on his success. We hope many will be induced to avail themselves of the convenient manual which has now been provided for the better understanding of the most remarkable poetical composition in the Bible.

---

*Meditations sur l'Essence de la Religion Chrétienne.* Par M. GUIZOT. Paris.

FROM an interesting preface we gather that this is the first of a series of four volumes which it is M. Guizot's intention to publish. The book is intended to record the author's thoughts on great religious problems and topics:—1. Natural Problems. 2. Christian Dogmas. 3. The Supernatural. 4. The limits of Science. 5. Revelation. 6. Inspiration of holy Scripture. 7. God according to the Bible. 8. Jesus Christ according to the Gospel. The treatment is liberal, candid, and as becomes a man of cultivated mind, who is at the same time an intelligent believer; but the book will fail to satisfy some.

---

*Lyra Messianica. Hymns and verses on the Life of Christ, ancient and modern; with other Poems.* Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans.

THIS volume is excellently printed on toned paper, and altogether a book of very attractive appearance. The editor has also performed his part with his uniform care and conscientiousness. A well-written preface supplies all necessary information regarding the plan and general sources of the work. Minuter details are furnished by the table of contents at the beginning, and by the indexes at the end of the volume. The preparation of this collection must have cost a large amount of labour, for it contains, not only original English pieces, but translations from the Greek, Latin, German, Spanish, Italian, and Swedish. Singularly enough there appear to be none from the French, although that language might have furnished at least enough to complete the series of principal representatives of "the holy Church throughout all the world." However, we are glad to find here Greek and Latin, Orthodox, Catholic and Protestant, Episcopalian and Lutheran, in harmony; all alike celebrating the praises of the Divine head of the Church. The translations are collected on the same broad principle, and are many of them remarkably beautiful and sweet. The original pieces, or those originally by English authors, are often admirable specimens of hymnology, but by no means all of equal beauty and merit. We do not read this book simply as critics, or we could except to the ideas and phraseology sometimes; but we read it as sacred poetry, the utterance of words and the vehicle of affections designed to honour the Saviour. Such a book may well admit a measure of poetic fancy, and therefore we look with pleasure even upon pictures which we

know are true in sentiment, if not exactly historical. We were very much charmed with the *Lyra Eucharistica* on many accounts, but we have no scruple in saying we like this *Lyra Messianica* better. It takes a wider range, and in its entirety it forms an unparalleled epic, a true Christiad, composed by Christians of many lands, in many ages. We know of nothing of the kind in our language equal to it.

*The Daily Service Hymnal.* London: Rivingtons.

THIS is a revised and corrected edition of Mr. Skinner's *Hymnal*, which thus appears in an improved form. To the public it will be recommended by its cheapness and fulness, and those of more literary tastes will be gratified to see an index in which, as far as possible, the pieces have been credited to the account of their actual authors. As this index has been compiled with the assistance of Mr. Sedgwick, the well-known authority in such matters, it deserves this special mention by us. The plan of the book extends over the Christian year, and comprises special Church work and occasional services.

*Dr. Pierotti and his Associates in the Defence of Jerusalem Explored.* By the REV. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D. With an Appendix of Documents. London: Bell and Daldy.  
*The Holy Places of Jerusalem: or, Fergusson's Theories and Pierotti's Discoveries.* By T. G. BONNEY, M.A., F.G.S. London: Bell and Daldy.

WE are sorry for two things in relation to the topography of Jerusalem—for the difference of opinion among the learned as to such places as Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and for the feeling which so often appears in discussions upon these points. Looking at the matter from the ground occupied by the Evangelists, we find that the great facts about which we may not doubt are, that Christ was crucified and buried, that this was near Jerusalem, and that one of the sites at least had a well-known name. Here our faith begins to waver; for, whether we accept the traditional holy sites or the scientific ones of Mr. Fergusson and others, we cannot forget the vicissitudes which Jerusalem underwent during the almost 300 years from the crucifixion to Constantine and his mother Helena. We feel almost more than an impulse not to believe in any of the theories, and to say, as was said of Moses, "No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day." And really but for Christian sentiment, would it be a momentous matter at all whether we know or not the precise spots or not? Christian sentiment has made it important, however, and Christian imagination has depicted the mount (?) and the cave where the Redeemer died and was buried.

Some time since, Dr. Pierotti, who had long resided at Jerusalem in a professional capacity, published a splendid work called *Jerusalem Explored*. Soon after its appearance it was accused of plagiarism by Mr. Fergusson, who said improper use had been made of his labours. Mr. Grove also declared that certain of the illustrations had been copied,

and were not originals. Mr. Tipping, too, another eminent authority, followed on the same side. Public faith was much shaken by these charges, and it was desirable that Dr. Pierotti should vindicate himself, or be vindicated. He did a little himself, but Mr. Williams, a well-known explorer in the field, read a paper in defence before the Oxford Architectural Society. This paper forms the basis of the pamphlet above mentioned. Mr. Williams refutes some of the charges, admits some and explains some. The result is, that Dr. Pierotti has committed some serious mistakes, but not to the extent alleged. The pamphlet is able and candid, and should be read by all who are interested in the controversy. Its value is increased by the documents appended to it.

The other pamphlet named above by Mr. Bonney is a clever examination chiefly of Mr. Fergusson's theories regarding the holy places. It puts in a clear light the objections to those theories, and if no more, it makes us feel that we ought not to yield implicit credence to them.

---

*Lectures on the Science of Language.* Delivered at the Royal Institution of Great Britain, in 1863. By MAX MULLER, M.A. London: Longmans.

THIS noble volume worthily follows its predecessor with the same title. On two accounts it deserves the study of Biblical scholars; first, for its statement of etymological principles, and, secondly, for its illustrations from ancient mythology. At present, we can only express our admiration of the book as a product of ripe scholarship, and fitted for extensive usefulness in its department. It is written in a very superior style.

---

*English Writers. The Writers before Chaucer; with an Introductory Sketch of the Four Periods of English Literature.* By HENRY MORLEY. London: Chapman and Hall.

THIS weighty volume overflows with information. The introductory sketch begins at the beginning, and comes down to our own age. Book I. also begins at the beginning—in prehistoric England—and tells us nearly all that can be told about our primeval history, and the growth of our language and literature till Chaucer's time. The volume would have been much more convenient divided into two, for "a great book is a great evil," though the book be good as this is.

---

*Evangelarium Hierosolymitanum, ex Codice Vaticano Palæstino deprompsit edidit Latine vertit prolegomenis ac Glossario adornavit* Comes Franc. Miniscalchi Erizzo. Tom. I. Veronæ.

THIS solid quarto contains the Syro-Chaldee (?) text of the Jerusalem Syriac Lectionary, long known to critics, but now, at length, published. It also contains a Latin version by the editor. On the appearance of the second volume, we shall be in a position to review it satisfactorily;

at present we can only hail the advent of a long-desired book, and observe that it is very handsomely printed and got up.

*The Novelities of Romanism.* In three parts:—I. Development of Doctrines. II. Chronological Arrangement. III. Old and New Creeds Contrasted. By CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE. Second Edition. Revised and enlarged. London: Religious Tract Society.

WE are old-fashioned or Puritanical enough to believe in books against Romanism, when such books are written as they ought to be. Happily the Protestant disputant is not required to exhaust the catalogue of coarse and vulgar, nay, obscene epithets which have always characterized the mass of Romish anti-Protestant writers, from Sir Thomas More's days down to our own. The writer just named, high and honourable as is his position and his reputation, flung at his opponents an amount of pollution which would disgrace any gentleman in our day, and win for him the renown of being anything but gentlemanly. His insults and slanders were couched in the broadest vernacular, as any one may now easily see who will take the trouble. Here is a mild specimen of his talk about the *Evangelicals*, as he calls them:—"These folk live in great towns, and fare well, and fast not, no, not so much as the three golden Fridays, that is, to wit, the Friday next after Palm Sunday, and the Friday next afore Easter Day, and Good Friday, but will eat flesh upon all three, and utterly love no Lenten fast, nor lightly no fast else, saving break-fast, and eat-fast, and drink-fast, and sleep-fast, and lusk-fast in their lechery, and then come forth and rail-fast." Sir Thomas showered his reproaches broadcast, and spared none, however eminent. His disciples remain to this day, and though they can hardly use the stiletto which Father Paul calls their pen, for the good reason that the Romanists tried to refute him by stabbing him twenty-two times,—they are characterized wherever they are by violent, abusive, slanderous, coarse, and cursing language. It would cost us no labour to produce any reasonable amount of proof of the truth of what we say with all sober sadness.

Mr. Collette avoids the rabid, random, and malignant manner which we have deprecated, and in a plain and earnest style, exhibits a succession of facts and reasonings which it will be easier to bespatter with abuse than to refute. The first part illustrates the development of doctrines in reference to supremacy; the canon of Scripture and its interpretation; transubstantiation, the invocation of saints, and image-worship; purgatory, penance, indulgences and tradition. This classified arrangement is followed by a chronological one, whereby we have shewn to us the growth and development of the allegorical and prophetic "mustard-tree," about which Dr. Wiseman preached a wily sermon a good many years ago. According to the Cardinal, the Church was only springing and germinant in apostolic days, and it has budded, and branched, and blossomed, and borne fruit in succeeding ages in accordance with God's intention. The facts adduced by Mr.

Collette would scarcely disturb the serenity of a Cardinal, but we venture to think they will produce an impression upon more candid souls, who will not fail to see that if Dr. Wiseman abides by the infallibility, he abandons the immutability of the ecclesiastical system. For assuredly immutability is scarcely reconcilable with the Darwinian hypothesis in theology and Church government. However, there is no mistake about it, we have the Cardinal's own words asserting the development theory. Mr. Collette's book was originated by the statement of a Romish prelate, somewhat contrary to the one we have reported, namely, "that he was the representative in this country of no new system of religion, and the teacher of no new doctrines." Jesuitical casuistry doubtless can reconcile the two, by shewing that all the branches, leaves, flowers, and fruits, ever borne by the spiritual mustard tree, were in the seed from which it sprung. We abhor such logic, and prefer to recommend for popular uses this calm and lucid statement of facts, the authorities for which have been carefully verified.

---

*The Adoption and other sermons ; preached in the Cathedral Church of Chester.* By the Rev. HUGH MC NEILE, D.D. London : James Nisbet and Co.

CANON Mc Neile is so well known as an uncompromising Protestant and a thorough Evangelical, that it will be needless for us to say what form of doctrine he preaches. His manner in these sermons is unadorned, his tone earnest, and his aim practical. The discourses are sixteen in number, and the subjects are : 1—3. The Adoption. 4, 5. Christianity of Old Testament Saints. 6. Contrition—Job. 7. Zeal and Prayer—Elijah. 8. Exposure of Idolatry—Isaiah. 9. The Trinity—Humbleness of mind. 10. The Trinity—Salvation. 11. The House of God. 12, 13. The Priest. 14. Living unto Christ. 15. The Birthright. 16. The Word of God always effective.

---

*The Christ of the Gospels and the Christ of Modern Criticism.* Lectures on M. Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. By JOHN TULLOCH, D.D. Macmillan and Co.

THESE lectures were written at Rome, and privately read there last winter. They supply another indication of the electric effect of M. Renan's *Life of Jesus*, and are at the same time an indication of the little alarm excited by it in the bosoms of thoughtful men. Possibly those who hailed the advent of that famous book with all the eagerness of joy and of hope, already begin to feel that it is not destined to produce any permanent diversion of extensive currents of popular thought. The six lectures of Principal Tulloch are valuable for their intellectual and moral qualities, and as a vindication of the bases of an intelligent faith. They treat M. Renan with becoming courtesy, which is what we cannot say of some who have written against him. As for the Gospels themselves, we feel quite at ease. They have been assailed so often in substantially the same way, and defended so suc-

cessfully with similar weapons, that we have no reason for fear. Notwithstanding assaults and partial defections, where we might have looked for better things, we imagine that there were never more who believed, or believed with a firmer faith, than in our own age of light and freedom.

---

*The Claims of the Bible and of Science.* Correspondence between a Layman and the Rev. F. D. MAURICE on some questions arising out of the controversy respecting the Pentateuch. Macmillan and Co.

A VERY well-written and thoughtful letter by "A Layman" precedes those of Mr. Maurice, and another from the same hand follows them. The letters of Mr. Maurice are upon a variety of topics:—the progressive character of revelation; the subject matter of the Bible, and how to read it; moral and physical studies; Biblical apologies; laws, generalizations, and the Christian faith; the facts of Bishop Colenso; faith in Christ, and the authorship of the Pentateuch; the Pentateuch; the deluge; current phrases in this controversy; the law courts, the people of God, and eternal punishment; opinions of bishops on the foundation of our hopes. It is impossible in a note, simply intended to chronicle Mr. Maurice's book—a thing we ought to have done before—to offer anything like a criticism of the book. We can only say, with the author's lay correspondent, that, without pledging ourselves to concurrence with all the opinions expressed in his letters, we are much obliged to him for them. They contain much wholesome truth, undoubtedly, and it is really important that we should have the thoughts of men from whom we may often differ, it is true, but whom, for their talent, candour, and earnestness we must always respect.

---

*Questions upon Scripture History.* By JAMES BEAVEN, D.D. Fourth Edition. Rivingtons.

THIS little book comprises a short literary and historical introduction to Scripture, and a series of questions extending over the whole of the Bible. The work is drawn up with great care, and will doubtless be of much service to those who seek to impart sound scriptural knowledge, whether in schools or families.

---

*Lectures on the Prayer Book, delivered in the Morning Chapel of Lincoln Cathedral in Lent, 1864.* By F. C. MASSINGBERD, M.A. Rivingtons.

THERE is an amount of popular ignorance about the Prayer Book which is very extraordinary, but which will be materially diminished if all who can will procure, read, and recommend this very instructive manual. There are other convenient books the aim of which is similar, but the form, style, and matter of this are such as to justify our special commendation.

---



*The Fifty-third Chapter of Isaiah. A Course of Lectures delivered in Holy Week and on Easter-day.* By ALFRED CODD, M.A. Rivingtons.

A VERY interesting and useful set of eight lectures upon Is. liii., in its application to the Messiah. The author has done his work very well, and in a thoroughly believing and religious spirit. Although the tone is occasionally apologetic, the lectures are well adapted for private reading for edification.

*The Illustrated Critical and Explanatory Pocket Commentary on the Old and New Testament, embodying the ripest results of modern criticism in a popular style.* By Rev. R. JAMIESON, D.D.; Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, A.M.; Rev. Prof. D. BROWN, D.D. Illustrated with chromo-lithograph engravings and maps. London: W. Wesley. Glasgow: W. Collins.

THERE is an immense amount of matter here for a small sum. The whole work consists of twelve parts, at a shilling each, comprising the text of the Authorized Version, with marginal readings, parallel references, a continuous commentary more than equal to the text in amount, pictorial illustrations, maps, etc. Among the multitude of good things which we find in every part of this work, none is to us more welcome than the religious, believing, earnest spirit which pervades it; and this is, we imagine, one of its highest recommendations for popular use. The authors have shewn commendable diligence in the execution of their weighty task, and we hope they and the publishers will be abundantly rewarded for the zeal to which we owe this book. Necessarily there are critical judgments with which we do not concur, especially in the Old Testament; but, on fundamental points, the work has afforded us great satisfaction, and the same is true of much of its detail.

*Eucharistic Meditations for a Month.* Translated and abridged from the French of Avrillon. Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Masters.

IN our last we called attention to the second part of this work. Since then we have received a complete copy, and are better able to see the plan and scope of the whole. There are twenty-eight meditations, or one for every day of a month of four weeks. The idea is then that of daily communion; and the language is that of one who is daily an actual communicant. We have not at hand the original work, but we have no doubt whatever that Mr. Shipley has faithfully and truly translated it in an abridged form. The volume is elegantly printed on toned paper, and everything about it is attractive in appearance. But we see more, rather than less, to justify the objection we made to the work on the former occasion. If the doctrine of the Sacrament is not the same in the Church of England as it is in the Church of Rome, we do not see that a clergyman can safely devote his time and talents to the publication of works which teach plain and simple transubstantia-

tion, without mitigation and without a word of remark. We are, some of us, very bad Christians if the doctrine of this book is all true.

Yet, after all, there are uses to which this book may be applied. In our own practice we have been accustomed for many years to Catholic books of devotion, meditations, and such like. We have found profit in these books by abstracting from them as we proceeded the truths which we found, whether doctrinal or practical, and mentally excluding what did not commend itself either to our sympathy or to our faith. This we think is not only a practicable but a proper course. The bee sucks honey from most flowers, but rejects what is not fitted for its use. The birds of the air, and the cattle on a thousand hills, all proceed on the same principle. And this is what we must do with the books we read. This is what we can do with the book of M. Avrillon so tastefully edited by the Rev. Mr. Shipley. The great drawback is that we cannot resign ourselves to the author's guidance uncontrolled, and that we have so frequently to exercise our discretion. The danger is that ordinary readers should thus resign themselves, and be unawares led into what we think to be error.

---

*Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Englisch-Theologische Forschung und Kritik.* Herausgegeben von Dr. M. HEIDENHEIM. Numbers VI., VI., VII. Gotha: Perthes.

PART VI. of Dr. Heidenheim's journal contains a paper founded on Dean Stanley's Eastern Churches, and one upon the cities of the Levites. There are also articles upon several other interesting topics, among which we observe one about the Codex Sinaiticus, and another describing certain Phœnician coins. Finally, the part contains notices of several English books recently published.

Part VII. contains several matters of interest, including the text and translation (by Mr. R. P. Smith) of the Samaritan Chronicle of Abn 'l Fatah. Another is an article on Syrian hymnology; and another, and the most interesting, is a transcript of Jude from the Vatican MS., printed in uncials, with a few notes.

This serial frequently contains articles of value to the student, and its editor manifestly endeavours to adapt it to this country as well as to Germany. We wish he may be well supported and successful in his learned labours.

---

*God's Way of Holiness.* By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. London: James Nisbet and Co.

RELIGION, as destined to elevate and bless our whole nature, may be viewed in its threefold relations, to the intellectual, moral, and physical powers of man. To the understanding it is the way of truth; to the heart it is the way of peace; and to the life it is the way of holiness. The religion which does not combine all these is radically and fatally defective. Man is so constituted, however, that he is prone to take a partial view of religion, and to walk accordingly. He is likely to fall into no mistake more than he is to be unfaithful to the way of holiness.

Such being our sentiments, we are pleased to find so earnest, popular, and scriptural a writer as Dr. Bonar giving us his thoughts about the way of holiness. "The same who said, 'Follow peace with all men,' said also, 'And holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.'" The present volume comprises nine chapters printed in a large clear type, and thirty-four pages of notes. We are grateful to the author for this faithful and zealous testimony in favour of holiness. We have been forgetting that Godliness is not a mere form, and creeds, and ordinances, and knowledge, but "the life of God in the soul of man;" we therefore want helps and stimulants to holiness, such helps and stimulants as shall impel us in the right direction. There is much thought in the book, and like all the works of the same writer, it is suggestive of thought. On the whole we much like the book.

---

*John Calvin: the Man and the Doctrine.* A Tercentenary Memorial.  
By ALEXANDER THOMSON, A.M. London: Jackson, Walford, and Hodder.

THIS essay was read before the Congregational Union in May last. We are glad of the opportunity of reminding some persons, that wholesale and indiscriminate vituperation and condemnation of John Calvin is by no means a righteous act. The teachings of John Calvin had immense influence in this country, in State as well as in Church, three centuries ago; and it is sheer folly to suppose that they can be eliminated from our national Christianity. We may denounce his "inexorable logic," but do we ever reflect how much we owe to that logic? or that logic has been defined as "the right use of reason?" The phrase at least should not be used, or if used should not be invidious, inasmuch as we cannot get rid of two texts of the New Testament (Rom. xii. 1; 1 Peter ii. 1), to the Greek of which we refer our readers. That John Calvin was something more than "inexorable logic," is made tolerably plain by the very interesting and well-written essay before us. Here in half an hour, and for a few pence, those who have not chronic Calvinophobia may find what will do them good. We do not mean to say we go so far as Mr. Thomson, but it is simply our duty to listen to men who have studied the great man, John Calvin, and not to take our cue from those who know nothing about him except that he was not an Arminian, and consented to the death of the Unitarian firebrand, Servetus. Do they, in fact, know even so much, except as idle traditions which they have picked up somewhere? It is very likely that those who denounce the predestinarianism of Calvin, do not all know that Arminianism is more recent as a system than his day, and that some of the schoolmen and fathers, and, above all, Augustine of Hippo, taught a predestinarian doctrine which it would be hard to distinguish from that of Calvin. Men talk as if Calvin invented the doctrine of election, and they talk very absurdly, the truth simply being that Calvin makes a very good target because he really advocated that doctrine, and made himself distasteful to Papists and Episcopalians generally, as well as to Unitarians. On the whole, it is much more cou-

venient to denounce Calvin than Augustine, but it would be much better to understand if not to refute them.

---

*Memoir of the Life and Episcopate of Dr. William Bedell, Lord Bishop of Kilmore.* By his Son-in-law, the REV. ALEXANDER CLOGY, M.A. Printed for the first time (with illustrative notes) from the original MS. in the Harleian collection, British Museum. London: Wertheim, Mackintosh, and Hunt.

THE editor of this volume, Mr. W. Walker Wilkins, has performed a service which will be very acceptable to the admirers of the good Bishop of Kilmore. Mr. Clogy's narrative is one of unusual interest, and our only wonder is that it has been allowed to slumber so long unpublished. Bishop Bedell was a man of rare parts and learning, and of apostolical piety and zeal; so much so, that Coleridge had good reason to call him "the most faultless character in all ecclesiastical history." If this praise is thought excessive, we are quite sure that the excellent prelate to whom it was given was one of the best of men, and one whose name deserves to be had in affectionate and reverent remembrance by all Christians. His life, which extended from 1570 to 1642, was a chequered one, and cannot be studied without profit and instruction. To the original memoir the editor has added a number of useful illustrative and explanatory notes. We value the book for the light it sheds upon the times in which the bishop lived, as well as for the information so curious and varied which it supplies respecting the man himself. For the present we can only thus briefly introduce this work to the notice of our readers, but we hope they will be induced to accept our hearty recommendation of it, and to procure it for their own perusal.

---

*An Apology for the Adoption of Pædobaptism.* By Rev. JOHN R. S. HARINGTON. London: Snow.

IN this little pamphlet, the author intimates that he was a student in a Baptist College, but became a convert to Pædobaptist principles. This is the only point on which he seems to have undergone a change of view, and therefore he naturally attached himself to the branch of the Congregationalists which practise the baptism of infants. The essay is a statement of the grounds upon which the writer was led to adopt the Pædobaptist opinions. Such as are at all concerned in this discussion will be interested in Mr. Harington's straightforward and intelligent statement.

---

*Sundry Quarterlies, etc.*—*The London Quarterly Review* for July contains a paper on Hannah's *Bampton Lectures*, and one upon Recent Theological Translations. *The American Quarterly Church Review* for July has four papers which we may mention: Uses and Abuses of Fiction; on Papal and Protestant Missions; Canon Wordsworth and Anglo-Italian Catholicity; Syllabus of Christian Doctrine. *The American Christian Examiner* for May has a paper on the

Evangelist's Debt to the critic. The American *Bibliotheca Sacra* for July has a paper on the Authorship of the Pentateuch; another on the Authorship of the Apocalypse; a third on the Doctrine of God's Providence; and a fourth is "Whedon on the Will." De Pressensé's *Bulletin Theologique* for June has a critical study on St. John's Gospel. Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift* (part iii., 1864) has an essay upon German materialism and theology; and also one on St. Mark's Gospel, and the Mark-hypothesis. The *Journal of the American Oriental Society* has articles on the Spiritual Life of the Soffees, and Materials for the history of the Muhammadan Doctrine of Predestination and Free-will; also, The Revelation of the Blessed Apostle Paul, translated from an ancient Syriac MS. (We hope to reprint this.) The *Christian Remembrancer* for July has a paper on Textual Criticism of the New Testament. The *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländ. Gesellschaft* has a very interesting account of the old MSS. of the Pentateuch possessed by the Samaritans. Dr. Rosen, the writer, gives several facsimiles.

---

We have received the following :—

- A Book for Young Women. By the Wife of a Clergyman. Eighth edition. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.
- A Book for Wives and Mothers. By the author of "A Book for Young Women." Third edition. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.
- A Plea for the Ancient Charitable Foundation of Rugby School. By A. H. Wratislaw, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy.
- Daniel the Prophet. Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford, with copious notes. By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. Oxford: J. H. and J. Parker. London: Rivingtons.
- Does the Cap Fit? In five small chapters. By the author of "Little Martha's Bible." London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt.
- Gleanings from British and Irish Ecclesiastical History; from the Introduction of Christianity to the period of the Reformation. By the Hon. Barbara Bedford. London: W. Macintosh.
- Homely Truths set forth in a homely style.
- Life, the day for work; exemplified in a brief Memoir (with extracts from her letters and diary) of the late Mrs. Baylie. London: Wertheim and Macintosh.
- Man: his true nature and ministry. From the French of Louis Claude de Saint Martin. By E. B. Penny. London: W. Allan and Co.
- Religious Reformation imperatively demanded. Bishop Colenso's critical inquiries answered, the inspiration of Scripture maintained. By James Biden. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.
- Report of three days' Meetings for Prayer and Addresses on the sure word of Prophecy; held in Freemasons' Hall, May 9th, 10th, and 12th, 1864. London: William Yapp.
- The English Bible: containing the Old and New Testaments according to the Authorized Version: newly divided into paragraphs; with concise introductions to the several books, notes, etc., etc. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.
- The Scriptural account of the Creation and Deluge; with reference to modern Geology. By Richard Gwatkin, B.D., F.G.S. Torquay: Cockren.

The Second Death. London: Church Press Company.  
True Revival; its nature, signs, results, and blessedness. Four short sermons  
By the Rev. R. H. Baynes. London: Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt.

*Recent Foreign Books.*

- Alaux, J. E.—La Philosophie de M. Cousin.  
Augustin, Saint.—Œuvres complètes. Traduites pour la première fois en français, sous la direction de M. Poujoulat et de M. l'abbé Raulx. T. 1<sup>er</sup>.  
Besson, l'abbé.—L'Homme-Dieu, conférences de Besançon.  
Bibelwerk, theologisch-homiletisches. Hrsg. v. J. P. Lange. Des Alten Testaments. Die Genesis od. das 1. Buch Mose. Theologisch-homiletisch bearb. v. Consist. R. Prof. Dr. J. P. Lange. Dasselbe. Des Neuen Testaments. Die beiden Briefe Pauli an die Thessalonicher. Theologisch-homiletisch bearb. v. Prof. Dr. C. A. Auberlen u. Prof. Dr. C. J. Riggenbach.  
Boissonnais, L.—Doctrine de la nouvelle école, d'après MM. Réville, A Coquerel fils et Colani.  
Böttcher, Dr. Frdr., Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum Alten Testamente. 2. Abth. 1 Regum—Psalmi. Nach dem Tode des Verf. hrsg. v. Dr. Ferd. Mühlau.  
Brugsch, Henri, Matériaux pour servir à la reconstruction du calendrier des anciens Egyptiens. Partie théorique, accompagnée de 13 planches lith.  
Buch, das, Ochlāh Wochlāh [Massora]. Hrsg., übers u. m. erl. Anmerkgn. versehen nach e., soweit bekannt, einzigen, in der kais. l. Bibliothek zu Paris befindl. Handschrift v. Oberlehr. Dr. S. Frensdorff.  
Carayon, le P. A.—Bibliographie historique de la compagnie de Jésus, ou Catalogue des ouvrages relatifs à l'histoire des Jésuites depuis leur origine jusqu'à nos jours.  
Casinius, Ant.—Qu'est-ce que l'homme? ou Controverse sur l'état de pure nature. Edition enrichie de notes et remarques, par le docteur J. Scheeben. Traduite et augmentée d'une préface par M. l'abbé Cros.  
Christian, P.—Le Catéchisme en histoires.  
Colani, T.—Examen de la Vie de Jésus de M. Renan.  
Coquerel, Etienne.—Libéraux et orthodoxes. Conférences pastorales.  
Coquerel fils, Athanase.—Le Catholicisme et la Protestantisme considérés dans leur origine et leur développement. Deux conférences.  
Darras, l'abbé J. E.—Histoire de N.-S. Jésus Christ, exposition des saints évangiles.  
Das Leben Jesu. Vorlesungen an der Universität zu Berlin im Jahr 1832 gehalten von Dr. Friedrich Schleiermacher. (From the author's MS. and reports of Students). By K. A. Rittenik. Berlin: Reimer.  
Die Israeliten zu Mekka von David's Zeit bis in's fünfte Jahrhundert unsrer Zeitrechnung. Ein Beitrag zur Alttestamentlichen Kritik und zur Erforschung des Ursprungs des Islams. Von Dr. R. Dozy. (Aus dem Holländischen Uebersetzt). Leipzig. 1864.  
Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments zusammenhängend untersucht. Von Dr. J. Chr. K. v. Hofman (Erlangen). 2 section, second part. Nördlingen.  
Dr. A. Neander's Vorlesungen über Geschichte der Christliche Ethik. Herausgegeben von Dr. David Erdmann. Berlin.  
Evangelische Glaubenslehre nach Schrift und Erfahrung von Harmon Plitt.  
Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum ex codice Vaticano Palestino deprompsit, edidit, latine vertit, prolegomenis ac glossario adornavit comes Franc. Miniscalchi Erizzo. Tomus 1.  
Ewald, H., Abhandlung üb. die grosse Karthagische u. andere neuentdeckte Phönikische Inschriften.  
Félix, le R. P.—Jésus-Christ et la Critique nouvelle. Conférences.  
Gaume, Mgr.—Traité du Saint-Esprit, comprenant l'histoire générale des deux esprits qui se disputent l'empire du monde et des deux cités qu'ils ont formées, avec les preuves de la divinité du Saint-Esprit.

- Geiger, Rabb. Dr. Abr., das Judenthum n. seine Geschichte. In 12 Vorlesgn. Rebst e. Anh.: Ein Blicl aus die neuesten Bearbeitgn. d. Lebens Jesu.
- Guizot.—Méditations sur l'essence de la religion chrétienne.
- Hilgenfeld, Prof. Dr. A., Bardesanes, der letzte Gnostiker.
- Histoire du Canon des Saintes Ecritures dans l'Eglise Chrétienne. Ed. Reuss. Second edition.
- Hoffmann, Dr. W., ein Jahr der Gnade in Jesu Christo. Predigten üb. die Evangelien aus alle Sonn, Fest. u. Feiertage. Mit kurzen Betrachtgn. üb. die einzelnen Zeiten d. Kirchenjahres. 3 Abth.
- Ibn Hischam, Abd el-Malik, das Leben Mohammed's nach Mohammed Ibn. Ishak bearb. Aus d. Arab. übers. v. Prof. Dr. Gust. Weil. 2 Bde.
- Instruction synodale de Mgr l'Evêque de Poitiers sur les principales erreurs du temps présent.
- Javal, Julien.—La Question religieuse au xix<sup>e</sup> siècle.
- Justi, Ferd., Handbuch der Zendsprache. Altbactrisches Wörterbuch. Grammatik. Chrestomathie.
- Keil, Carl Frdr., u. Frz. Delitzsch, biblischer Commentar üb. das Alte Testament. Die Bücher Samuels.
- Lafont.—Preuves évidentes de la divinité de Jésus-Christ.
- Laurent de Saint-Aignan, l'abbé.—La Terre Sainte. Description complète de tous les lieux célèbres de la Palestine. In-8, avec cartes, plane et grav.
- Mörle, J. G. C., Palästina. Geschichte u. Beschreibung v. heiligen Landes. Für Volksschulen bearb. Mit 1 (lith.) Kärtchen.
- Müller, Dr. Alois, Esmun. Ein Beitrag zur Mythologie d. oriental. Alterthums.
- Otto, Prof. Dr. J. C. T., d. Patriarchen Gennadios v. Konstantinopel Confession, Kritisch untersucht u. hrsg. Nebst e. Excurs üb. Arethas' Zeitalter.
- Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor: Burchadus de Monte Sion, Riccoldus de Monte Crucis, Odoricus de foro Julii, Wilbrandus de Oldenborg, quorum duos nunc primum edidit, duos ad fidem librorum mscr. recensuit J. C. M. Laurent.
- Pohlmann, Prof. Dr. Ant., Sancti Ephraemi Syri commentariorum in sacram scripturam textus in codicibus Vaticonis manuscriptus et in editione Romana impressus. Commentatio critica. Part. 2.
- Renan, Ernest.—Trois inscriptions phéniciennes trouvées à Oumm-el-Awamid.
- Reusch, Prof. Dr. Fr. Heinr., Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. 2, verb. Aufl.
- Reuss, Ed.—Histoire de la Theol. Chrétienne au siècle Apostolique. 3rd Ed.
- Reuss, Ed.—Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neues Testamentes. 4 aufl.
- Schenkel, Prof. Dr. Dan., das Charakterbild Jesu. Ein bibl. Versuch 3 aufl.
- Scriptorium Græciæ orthodoxæ bibliotheca selecta. Ex. codicibus manuscriptis partim novis curis recensuit partim nunc primum eruit Dr. Hugo Laemmer. Vol. I. Sectt. 1 et 2.
- Tauler's, Joh., Predigten. Nach den besten Ausg. in die jetzige Schriftsprache übertragen. 2 Aufl. Neue Bearb. v. Dr. Jul. Hamburger.
- Ueberweg, Prof. Dr. Frdr., Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie von Thales bis auf die Gegenwart. Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der patristischen Zeit.
- Vorlesungen über Neutestament-liche Theologie. Von Dr. Ferd. Christian Baur. Edited by Ferd. Fried. Baur.
- Vullers, Joa. Aug., Lexicon Persico-Latinum etymologicum cum linguis maxime cognatis Sanscrita et Zendica et Pehlevica comparatum, e lexicis persice scriptis Borhâni Qâti, Haft Quzum et Bahâri agam et Persico-Turcico Farhangi-Shuûri confectum, etc. Accedit appendix vocum dialecti antiquioris, Zend et Pazend dictas.
- Zur Geschichte der Neuesten Theologie. Dr. Carl Schwartz. 3rd Ed.
- Zwei Bilingue Papyrus die wichtigsten schriftdenkmäler zur entzifferung Alt-ägyptischer Texte, nächst den inschriften von Rosette. Dr. H. Brugsch.

### MISCELLANIES.

---

*Early Christian Glass.*—For many years great interest has been felt in the catacombs of Rome and their contents. Intimately connected as they are with the early history of Christianity, with the struggling Church and her martyrs, it is not surprising that the relics derived from them should have been, and still continue to be, much valued. Among these there are few more curious than the fragments of ornamented glass. They consist of portions of vessels with designs in gold leaf enclosed between two layers of glass, and thus protected from the destructive effect of time. They may be divided into two classes, viz., 1st. The larger medallions, apparently the bottoms of shallow bowls, in which the designs have clear white glass backgrounds, with touches of colour in a few rare instances on the dresses. 2nd. The smaller medallions, probably from the sides of vessels, in which the backgrounds are coloured, the tints being generally blue, violet, green, or amber-colour.

These fragments are found stuck externally into the mortar with which the *loculi* or tombs were closed; they seem to have been generally inserted in a fragmentary state, the sides of the glass bowl having been occasionally trimmed off with care so as to leave a circular medallion. Glass vessels entire are also to be found fixed in the mortar, but they are of different form, being deep cups or bottles of plain glass, and appear to have been intended for liquids. It is about these that so much discussion has been raised in recent times, as to whether they contained wine or the blood of martyrs.

The object of fixing the gilt glass on the outsides of the tombs has never been explained, unless for mere ornament; nor has it been satisfactorily decided to what use the vessels from which the fragments are derived were applied; their form does not fit them for chalices, and the inscriptions and occasional pagan subjects do not accord with such a use. The best suggestion seems to be that they were for the Agapæ, or love-feasts of the Christians, which are known to have been held at the tombs of martyrs. Another difficulty has not been solved, which is that they are not found anywhere but at Rome, and there only in the catacombs.

These representations have a peculiar value from their genuine nature. Fresco paintings may have been restored or meddled with both in ancient and modern times, but these designs are protected from destruction by the vitreous coat with which they are covered, and are from their nature exempt from all tampering. Their small size, moreover, fits them to be taken into foreign lands, and to be the representatives of the earliest Christian art in countries to which neither the paintings nor sarcophagi could conveniently be carried.

The range of subjects is not very great, and from the nature of the work they are treated in a simple way without background or a multiplicity of figures.

The subjects from the Old Testament are as follows:—The Tempta-



tion of Adam and Eve, Noah in the Ark, Sacrifice of Abel, Moses striking the Rock, the Spies, Tobit and the Fish, the Fiery Furnace, Daniel and the Dragon, History of Jonah, and the sacred ornaments in the Temple, especially the golden candlestick.

Among those from the history of the New Testament is the Pastor Bonus, Bust of Christ, Miracle of Cana, Miracle of the loaves, Raising of Lazarus, the Paralytic Man.

The subjects from early Christian history comprise figures of St. Peter and St. Paul, in a few cases accompanying the Virgin, early Roman bishops and saints, such as St. Timothy, St. Xystus, St. Agnes, etc.

There are a few subjects of a domestic character, such as portraits of men with their wives and children; sometimes with, sometimes without, the Christian monogram. Others of Pagan, or at any rate not avowedly Christian, origin, viz., representations of coins, the three *Monetæ*, *Dædalus*, chariots and games, Pagan divinities, animals and inscriptions.

The period to which these objects may be referred is probably the third and the fourth centuries after Christ. From the occurrence among the designs of representations of coins of Caracalla, it has been conjectured that some of the specimens are as early as the reign of that emperor. Buonarotti was disposed to assign them chiefly to the time of the Gordians and two Philips; but among the designs are representations of St. Vincentius martyred in Spain, under Dacian, and of Marcellinus, Bishop of Rome, put to death under Diocletian. Moreover, the costumes of some of the figures, and the peculiar names and orthography, indicate a date not earlier than the fourth century.

From the period to which they belong and the nature of their workmanship, these little pictures possess no great merit as specimens of art. They exhibit, moreover, occasionally what must be looked upon as mere blunders of the workmen employed in making them. For the history of Christian iconography, however, they furnish us with very precious materials, fully compensating for their rudeness and want of merit in an artistic point of view.

The most remarkable specimens in the Matarozzi Collection are the following:—

1. A circular medallion,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches in diameter, engraved in Garrucci (pl. iii., fig. 13). It represents Daniel and the Dragon. The subject is in a square panel: at the extreme right is seen the head of the dragon, rising apparently from rocks: Daniel, in a short dress, is giving the cake of pitch, fat, and hair to the dragon, and turns his head away so as to face the spectator: behind him is a figure with nimbus, clad in a longer dress, which he holds up with his left hand, while with his right he extends a staff towards Daniel. This figure is identical with that of Christ when working miracles, as represented in other specimens of catacomb glass: for instance, in the raising of Lazarus (Garrucci, pl. viii., fig. 7), and it may perhaps have been introduced to mark the divine protection and influence under which Daniel acted. This medallion furnishes us with the only complete representation of the subject to be found in the catacomb glasses, and it explains several medallions of the smaller variety

with coloured grounds, where a figure is to be seen holding a cake. This has been erroneously explained by Padre Garrucci as one of the three kings or magi, a subject not found on this class of Christian art. It has been already suggested that the smaller medallions were inserted in the sides of glass vessels; by adding two other medallions, one with a dragon, and the other with a figure of Christ with a staff (both of which occur), the subject would be rendered complete.

2.-Medallion, 3 inches in diameter, representing Moses striking the rock, engraved in Garrucci (pl. ii., fig. 10). This is the only large representation of the subject on the catacomb glass. Moses is represented in the ordinary Roman dress, striking the rock with a wand; below the stream of water an Israelite is bending on one knee. Around is inscribed *HILARIS PIE ZESES CVM TVIS IN DEO*: "Drink, Hilaris, may you live with yours in God." There is a singular symbolical treatment of this subject, engraved in Garrucci (pl. x., fig. 9), where St. Peter, with his usual tonsured head, takes the place of Moses, and for fear of error, his name is introduced at the side.

3. Medallion, 4 inches in diameter with busts of St. Peter and St. Paul (Garrucci, pl. xii., fig. 4). The two saints have peculiar tonsures, differing from those now used in the Roman Church: between them is a figure of Christ, youthful and beardless, holding a crown over each of them. The inscription here is *BICVLIVS DIGNITAS AMICORVM VIVAS PIE ZESES*: "Viculus, an honour to your friends, may you live. Drink [and] live."

4. A large medallion, 5 inches in diameter, representing St. Peter and St. Paul seated in chairs, with a wreath between them (Garrucci, pl. xiv., fig. 4).

5. A circular medallion, 3½ inches in diameter; divided in two by a horizontal line (Garrucci, pl. xvii., fig. 2). In the upper part are four beardless figures standing between columns and holding rolls: the names of only three of them are preserved, viz., *PAVLVS*, *SYSTVS*, *LAURENTEVS*. In the lower compartment are three busts. That in the centre is an aged tonsured head, misnamed *CRISTVS*; the other two are inscribed *IPPOLITVS* and *TIMOTEVS*. The word *Cristus* may possibly be a mistake for *Calistus*. Of these personages, St. Hippolytus suffered martyrdom in 257, and St. Sixtus and St. Laurence in the following year.

6. A remarkable medallion, 3½ inches in diameter, with a square panel enclosing a bust of the Saviour, beardless, and with hair short in front and hanging down behind, so as to rest on the shoulders in large masses. At the corners are four beardless busts (Garrucci, pl. xviii., fig. 1).

7. A fragment with another bust of the Saviour enclosed in a circle, and represented as the last. Around are the remains of an arcade, which has been supported by six columns, with draped figures between them (Garrucci, pl. xviii., fig. 2).

These two specimens seem to furnish the best representations of the Saviour to be found on the catacomb glasses, and are of great value in an iconographic point. In both cases they are inscribed *CRISTVS*, and are without any nimbus.

8. A medallion, unfortunately much injured; diameter, 4 inches

(Garrucci, pl. xxix., fig 4). It represents a Roman with his wife and two children, all standing. Above is the inscription, POMPEIANE TEODORA VIVATIS: "Pompeianus [and] Theodora, may you live." Their faith is indicated by the monogram of Christ placed between them.

9. A circular medallion, in fine preservation;  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches in diameter (Garrucci, pl. xxxix., fig. 5, and d'Agincourt, Pittura, pl. xii). It represents busts of Severus, Cosmas, and their child Lea.

10. A circular medallion, 4 inches in diameter (Garrucci, pl. xxxv., fig. 1, and Passeri, Lucernæ Fictiles, vol. iii., pl. xcii). This is the most remarkable specimen in the Collection; not only from the unquestionably pagan character of the representation upon it, but also from the occurrence of some coloured details on the dresses. It represents busts of a Roman and his wife; on their dresses are touches of an opaque dull red and a pale opaque blue enamel. Between them, on a circular stand, is a figure of Hercules with his club and lion's skin, and holding in his hand the apples of St. Hesperides. Around is the inscription, ORFITVS ET COSTANTIA IN NOMINE HERCVLIS ACERENTINO FELICES BIBATIS: "Orfitus and Constantia, in the Acheruntine, name of Hercules may you live (or drink) happy." The title Acheruntinus as applied to Hercules is known and is applied to him in connection with one of his labours—the descent into Hades to fetch up Cerberus, whom he found on the banks of the Acheron. As Horace says, "Perrupit Acheronta Hercules labor." Such a design would be considered appropriate on a cup to be used in a marriage, as Hercules was famous for his numerous progeny; while there may be also some allusion to his having brought back Alcestis from the shores of the Acheron to her faithful spouse Admetus.—*The Fine Arts Quarterly Review*, May, 1864.

The Rev. P. S. Desprez, of Alvediston, Salisbury,<sup>a</sup> proposes to publish a new exposition of Daniel and of the Revelation of St. John. The former part, already near completion, will consist of a continuous interpretation of the elder Apocalypse, and will be divided into ten chapters, of which the substance of the ninth is given in the present number of this Journal. The latter, consisting also of ten chapters, will be devoted to the *revised* examination of the second Apocalypse, a subject upon which some attention has been already bestowed. The author requests those who are interested in the matter to encourage him in his undertaking, by ordering (from him) copies of the work beforehand; his circumstances not allowing him to incur the sole risk of publication. The price of the work will be about 12s.

---

<sup>a</sup> Author of *The Apocalypse Fulfilled*. Third Edition. 1861.

---

#### TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

*Although the present Number contains eight pages extra, the Editor regrets the non-publication of some important matters, owing to circumstances over which he has no control.*

THE  
JOURNAL  
OF  
SACRED LITERATURE  
AND  
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XII.—JANUARY, 1865.  
~~~~~

**OF THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF DIVINE INSPIRATION:**

ILLUSTRATED BY EXTRACTS FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS.

**I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.**

THE subject upon which we now enter is one of great and growing importance. There are men of scientific habits, whether their predilections are in favour of physical, mental, or moral science, who have arrived at conclusions which militate against the common faith. There are men of learning, and with a reputation as scholars and critics, who have moved in the same direction. What these think, is already known to many who labour at the anvil, the loom, and the plough. In workshops and on the highways, as well as in halls of science and colleges, the fact of divine inspiration and intervention is freely discussed. While, however, many have abandoned long-established and dearly-cherished opinions, there are many in each of the enquiring classes who have remained faithful to recognized and catholic doctrine, and who believe, as they always have believed, in a real, direct, and distinct divine inspiration of the authors of the Bible. But it is not to be denied that the tendency to reject the special and immediate action of the Almighty, both in nature and in religion, has grown very strong in more directions than one. At the same time those who reduce that

action to the minimum, as it regards creation, the course of nature, providence, and so forth, seldom exclude it in every sense from religion. But the result of an impression produced thousands of years or of ages ago, must be distinguished from a constant, an immediate, or an intentional influence; and a character given to human mind as human mind, must not be confounded with a specific action exercised upon an individual, and limited to him. Did the Almighty create the universe at first, and endow certain parts of it with powers of production and reproduction, of development, repeated action, and self-preservation, and leave it, to run its round, whether for a time or for ever? Is He only the framer of a vast machine in which all the parts move by rule and law, which needs not or has not his actual, present superintendence and control, and which is under no restraint except that of a finite and limited nature? Has He withdrawn from the work of his own hands, and retired again to the solitude of his own eternal self-sufficiency? Does He sit in his inaccessible glory, as in some lofty Olympus, to watch, or not to watch, the motions of the creatures He has fashioned? Or does He still take some actual interest in this work of his, and in any way control, moderate, or interfere with its action? If He interferes, is it in that which is physical, moral, or intellectual? If with one, why not with all, since his perfection must comprise all these? If with all, when, how, how far, and why?

So far as we are able to perceive, science and philosophy cannot go far towards answering these questions. Science deals with facts, and with phenomena; and it may reason upon all the causes which the schoolmen have imagined, but facts and phenomena are its true domain, whether isolated, or in certain relations and connections. Causes, whether first causes, secondary causes, or any other, are often difficult to discover, define, demonstrate, and always involve some question which science cannot answer. It is owing to this that we have so many explanations of one and the same phenomenon. The variations of science are as notorious as those of religious sects. That which is accepted as scientific to-day, may be effete to-morrow. Under all circumstances, therefore, we decline to accept the dicta of science as final, if nowhere else, yet at least in regard to the supernatural. Yet amid the throng of questions which science is now forcing upon our attention, no one is really more un-mistakeable than that of the supernatural, or the part which God has in nature, in miracles, and in revelation. The daring of science in reference to the supernatural has in our day attained, we hope, its extremest limits. We own there are not

a few things in the Bible which are mysterious and obscure, and which may be explained as hyperbolic and metaphorical, but it undoubtedly teaches the distinct formation of man and other animals, by the divine Hand, much as they are : but if we are to believe some of our philosophers, God never actually made man at all ; He made only the germs and rudiments which, by a series of progressive developments continued through an untold series of ages, have branched out into higher forms of life, more perfect and elaborate organizations, and nobler sentient or mental conformations. It is true that the rude acorn may produce an oak, with root, stem, branches, and fruit ; but it does not follow that the oak thus developed from the acorn will or can produce acorns which in turn shall produce something better than an oak. The only alternation which we have been able to find recorded in history, is that from the full-grown organism to the germ, and from the germ to the full-grown organism : the oak has always produced the acorn, and the acorn has always produced the oak.

While we have one class of philosophers reasoning upon normal resemblances, typical forms, and possible developments, we have another trying to shew that actual differences preclude the idea of a common origin, even for those races which are most nearly alike. They ask, How can the Kaffir and the Caucasian both alike descend from Adam ? The others ask, Why Kaffir and Caucasian may not have descended from, or arisen out of, far lower forms of animal life ? On the face of it, each of these enquiries is hostile to the Bible, which teaches us that all men have sprung from one Adam, and that animals in general were created much as we find them. The Bible is the one point where these two schools come into contact, and from which they both turn away in doubting whether God has really made things what they are.

And now to come more directly to the question before us, Is there any good reason to believe that God ever acts upon mind, upon men's inner, nobler, moral, intellectual, or spiritual nature ? The general belief is that this is possible ; and there neither are nor have been many religious creeds which have not recognized a distinct divine influence upon human nature,—an influence not uniform, but exceptional and special, although profoundly real. The Jews maintain that it is owing to some such influence, in certain forms and degrees, that we owe the books of the Old Testament. This influence is what we call inspiration. So far as we have been able to find, Christians in all ages, and in every part of the world, and of every sect, agree with the Jews that the Old Testament was given by inspiration,

and differ from them substantially in this, that they extend the idea to the New Testament. But those who thus generally admit as a fact the divine inspiration of the Scriptures or of their writers, exhibit serious disagreements as to the explanation of that fact. There have always been some, and of late years many, who have believed in the distinct inspiration of every sentence, word, and letter; so that the sacred penmen did no more than write an accurate copy of what the Holy Spirit dictated.

Some maintain that the divine inspiration is that of ideas; that the thoughts and sense were given by the Holy Spirit, and the language was that of the individual writers.

Some hold that only the prophetic messages are verbally inspired, and that for the other portions of the Scriptures the degree of inspiration, as well as its form, varied with the character of what was written, so that in such portions the writers were moved to write, generally directed in the selection of topics, and preserved from error.

Some are of opinion that, properly speaking, inspiration is only that of prophecies and all facts beyond the knowledge of the sacred penmen, and of religious and possibly of moral truths.

Some look upon inspiration as little more than suggestion, or prompting and superintendence.

Some regard it as almost, if not quite, identical with that mysterious influence by which men in all ages and countries appear to have been stimulated to the utterance of noble and lofty truths and sentiments.

We shall not criticize these various explanations, but in the face of a strong tendency to materialism, we had almost said fatalism, the worship of natural law, the canonization of doubt, and the apotheosis of reason, it is absolutely necessary that something should be done by those who admit divine inspiration as a fact. Can there not be something like joint action among us? We think there can; because, 1, no definite theory of inspiration seems to be laid down in the Bible itself: none at least which is unmistakeable; and, 2, there is no uniform rule or theory propounded by ancient Christian writers and councils, nor by authors of more recent date. A certain liberty seems to have been generally conceded as to the explanation of the one great fact which is everywhere either assumed, or stated, or proved, or implied, while inspiration is not authoritatively defined. The dogma of inspiration is catholic, but there is no catholic doctrine of inspiration. It is in vain that our eye wanders over the confessions of faith and articles of what may be called orthodox churches in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Our search for an official definition of inspiration among

these, is as hopeless as a like search among the canons and creeds of the preceding ages. We meet everywhere with the fact, implied or asserted, and the theology of every period furnishes us with valuable indications of the ideas which were prevalent. But why did no church feel called upon to pronounce authoritatively upon this matter? Why? Because the recognition of the fact was regarded as the one thing essential, and because explanations and theories were viewed as secondary and subordinate. It is another fact, that both in the Eastern and the Western churches of early times, the words *theopneustia* and *inspiratio* were used with considerable latitude of meaning. Both these terms were predicated of writings other than the canonical, and of persons who took no part in writing the sacred canon. This fact is of some importance, because it shews that the words were not understood as of necessity implying that literal and verbal plenary inspiration for which some now plead. Yet it can hardly be said that the true doctrine of inspiration was only partially understood till these last days, because we find every essential and important doctrine of religion in the writings of every age of the Church.

---

## II. EXTRACTS FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS.

The preceding remarks will, it is hoped, prepare the reader for diversities of opinion in the extracts which follow. These extracts have been mostly selected intentionally from authors who have written since the Reformation, and not within the last generation. They have been taken from the works of Catholics and Protestants, and it is hoped they represent most of the sections of the latter. We have endeavoured to preserve impartiality, because the question belongs not to one community, but to all. On some accounts it has been thought best to translate those which were written in French, and to give such as are in Latin in their original form. It would have been easy to multiply these extracts to any extent, but we have preferred to take so many as we could find room for, and that without excluding those from men of less celebrity. The reason for this last feature is, that writers of average reputation are very likely to represent average opinions.

We shall hope to return to the subject, and then to offer farther illustrations from various sources, and such concluding remarks as may seem most appropriate. At present we may observe how small a proportion of the writers we have consulted advocate the plenary verbal inspiration of every part of Scripture, which they yet hold to be truly the Word of God.



1. WOLFGANG MUSCULUS.—“That most high and everlasting authority of the canonical Scripture cometh from none other, but from God as the author of it: and the holy writers wrote, not by the motion of the Church, but by the instinct of the Holy Spirit; and therefore did write, not as members of the Church but as the interpreters of God, and ministers of the Spirit.”<sup>a</sup>

2. JOHN CALVIN.—“Ut Scripturæ authoritatem asserat, ‘Divinitus esse inspiratam’ docet. Nam si ita est nihil amplius restat controversiæ quin reverenter suscipienda sit ab hominibus. Hoc principium est quod religionem nostram ab aliis omnibus discernit, quod scimus Deum nobis loquutum esse, certoque persuasi sumus, non ex suo sensu loquutos esse prophetas, sed ut erant Spiritus Sancti organa, tantum protulisse quæ cælitus mandata fuerant. Quisquis ergo vult in Scripturis proficere, hoc secum in primis constituat, Legem et Prophetias non esse doctrinam hominum arbitrio proditam; sed a Spiritu Sancto dictatam. Siquis objiciat, undenam id sciri possit: respondeo, ejusdem Spiritus revelatione tam discipulis quam doctoribus Deum pateferi Authorem.”<sup>b</sup>

3. RICHARD HOOKER.—“The light of nature is never able to find out any way of obtaining the reward of bliss, but by performing exactly the duties and works of righteousness. From salvation, therefore, and life, all flesh being excluded this way, behold how the wisdom of God hath revealed a way mystical and supernatural, a way directing unto the same end of life, by a course which groundeth itself upon the guiltiness of sin, and, through sin, desert of condemnation and death. . . . Concerning that faith, hope, and charity, without which there can be no salvation, was there ever any mention made saving only in that law which God himself hath from heaven revealed? There is not in the world a syllable muttered with certain truth concerning any of these three, more than hath been supernaturally received from the mouth of the eternal God. Laws, therefore, concerning these things are supernatural, both in respect of the manner of delivering them, which is divine; and also in regard of the things delivered, which are such as have not in nature any cause from which they flow, but were by the voluntary appointment of God ordained besides the course of nature, to rectify nature’s obliquity withal.”<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> W. Musculus, *Common Places*: English translation, fol. 153; edition 1563.

<sup>b</sup> Calvin in 2 Tim. iii. 16.

<sup>c</sup> Hooker, *Ecclesiastical Polity*, i. 11.

DR. HAMMOND.—“For all those writings which, either by God’s Spirit of prophecy, or by any other afflation or incitation from God, have at any time been written by the prophets, etc., and as such received into the Canon of the Jewish Church, may by us be profitably made use of, to teach us many things that Christ hath taught us, to convince us of the grossness of many sins which are confidently practised among men, to reduce those that fall through error or ignorance, to build up those that have begun and set out in the way of righteousness.”<sup>d</sup>

5. BENEDICT PICTET.—“After having established the divinity of the books of the Old and of the New Testament, it is not necessary to prove that they have been inspired of God; the thing speaks for itself, and St. Paul teaches us it; ‘all Scripture,’ says he, ‘is divinely inspired.’ To be convinced of it, a few reflections must be made. . . . But in order not to be deceived in the matter of the inspiration of the sacred books it is proper to make certain remarks.

“1. It is not necessary to suppose that the Spirit of God always dictated to the prophets and apostles all the words which they employed, and that he taught them all that they wrote. It suffices to believe that they wrote nothing but by the immediate direction of the Spirit of God, so that this Spirit never suffered them to err in what they wrote. Agobard, a writer of the ninth century, in his reply to Fredigisus, says that it is an absurdity to believe that the Holy Spirit inspired the terms and words. The apostles, as one has very well said, were the organs of the Holy Spirit, but reasonable organs, who made use of their understanding, of their judgment, and of their own language; yet in such a manner, that in the use which they made of their mind, they were directed by the Spirit of God, who took not from them the faculty of reasoning, which they had naturally, but enlightened it by his heavenly light, and directed it by his secret influence.

“2. It cannot be denied that the Holy Spirit suggested countless things which the sacred authors wrote, as the prophecies which are scattered over their writings, and the explanation of these prophecies, of ancient oracles, of all the types, and of all the figures of the old covenant. St. Paul, in 1 Tim. iv. 1, tells us that the Spirit says in express terms, that in the last times many shall revolt from the faith. The ancient prophets said, ‘The mouth of the Lord hath spoken,’ etc.

“But it must also be avowed that the holy men of God wrote

---

<sup>d</sup> Hammond, *Paraphrase on 2 Tim.* iii. 16.

many things, with which they had no need that the Holy Spirit should inspire them; such as what they had seen, what they had heard, and what related to their particular affairs. We ought never to have recourse to miracles without necessity. Why then suppose that God suggested to the prophets and apostles what they knew already?

"3. Nevertheless, although all they wrote was not suggested to them, they still wrote nothing without the Holy Spirit of God guiding their pen, so that they wrote nothing which was not apropos and according to the most exact rules of truth. It was the Spirit which moved them to write. It was the Spirit which strengthened their memory. It was the Spirit which presided over the choice of matters which were to enter into their work. It was the Spirit which made them often employ certain expressions rather than others because they expressed better what ought to be said. In fine, it was the Spirit which prevented them from falling into any error, even in the smallest things.

"4. After what I have said, no one must wonder, 1. If the apostles often speak of things which relate to their own concerns, as when St. Paul orders them to bring him his cloak and his parchments: 2. If they draw consequences from the truths which have been suggested to them by the Holy Ghost, from the visions which they have seen, and from the things which they have learned by means of their senses or some other way; as St. Peter, when comparing the vision of the sheet which he had had, with that which Cornelius had had, said, 'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons:' 3. If they employ modes of speech derived from the custom of the peoples among whom they lived, and even proverbs usual in their time: 4. If we observe a difference of style in the sacred books. All this is very easily conceived, after we grant that the Holy Spirit left the servants of God the use of their reason, and that he allowed them to employ the language of their country.

"5. But we must still remember what I have established above: 1. That the Spirit of God suggested to them the greater part of the things which they wrote: 2. That he presided over all that they wrote, in such sort that they were infallible in all their books. It is also apparent that these sacred writers agree with each other admirably, although they write in a different manner, because one same Spirit animated them, as I have elsewhere said.

"6. It is very needful to remark that I have said that the apostles were infallible in their writings and in their doctrines only; for in other respects they were not without sin and with-

out weaknesses. It was not necessary that the holy men who wrote the sacred books should be perfectly holy and without defect; but it was absolutely necessary that they should be infallible in their doctrine, because God employed their ministry to regulate the faith and morals of nations. Therefore it ought not to seem strange if St. Peter does something which merits the censure of St. Paul, when he breaks off from fellowship with the Gentiles out of too much consideration for the Jews.

“Before concluding this chapter I have still two reflections to make on this subject, which will serve to resolve two difficulties.

“The first reflection is, that the Holy Spirit who led the apostles into all truth did not teach them all things at once, but he increased their knowledge every day according as they had need of it for the edification of the Church. We should not be too much surprised, therefore, if it appears that St. Peter was unaware of the calling of the Gentiles before the baptism of Cornelius.

“The second reflection is, that the Holy Spirit only revealed to the sacred writers what it was fitting they should know and should teach to others. Thus it is not surprising that they sometimes speak doubtfully; ‘and it may be that I will abide, yea, and winter with you,’ says St. Paul to the Corinthians (2 Cor. xvi. 6), and instead of marking the precise time when certain things occurred they say, ‘About six months,’ ‘about the sixth hour,’ ‘about thirty years of age’ (Luke i. 56; iii. 23; etc.)

“After these two reflections I have no more to add, except that the inspiration of the sacred books has been always believed in the Church, as has been very well proved by the testimonies of Clement, Bishop of Rome; of Justin Martyr; of Theophilus of Antioch; of St. Irenæus, who says that the Scripture is the work of the Word of God; and of Clement of Alexandria, who calls the sacred writers the disciples of the Spirit; of Tertullian; of Origen, who sustains that the very smallest letter of Scripture has been placed by divine wisdom; and of St. Jerome, who declares in one of his books that it is wrong not to receive the Epistle to Philemon under the pretext that it contains things of very small importance. For, says he, ‘if they do not believe that little things can have the same author as things the most elevated, they must say with Valentinus, Marcion and Apelles, that He who created ants, worms, lice, and locusts, is not the

---

\* *Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ. Adv. Hær., ii. 47, cf. iii. 1.*

Creator of heaven, earth, sea, and angels.' We might bring forward passages from St. Augustine, Theodoret, etc., which prove the same thing."<sup>f</sup>

[The preceding extracts from the *Théologie Chrétienne* of Benedict Pictet (vol. i., book i., chap. xvi.; edition of 1708), are accompanied by notes, the most important of which is that which follows, upon "Objections against the inspiration of the sacred books."]

"Josephus in his reply to Apion (chap. i.), speaking of the prophets, says they wrote by inspiration, and by the motion of the Spirit of God. In regard to the first Christians the thing is certain. Therefore I have nothing more to do here than to reply to some difficulties which might be raised.

"1. It will be said that there are books in Scripture where we do not find even the name of God, as in the Book of Canticles and in the Book of Esther. But this reasoning proves nothing: 1. Because in order that a book be inspired of God it is not necessary that the name of God should be in it. 2. In regard to the Book of Canticles, where everything is described in figurative terms, and where Jesus Christ is represented to us under the emblem of a Spouse, it is not surprising that the name of God should not be there. There is more cause for wonder in the case of the Book of Esther; but there are several things which persuade me that this book has not been regarded as divine by the Jews without strong reasons. It is not probable that the Jews would have received it as canonical, if they had not certainly known that it had been written by a prophet, when they were so nice on these matters: and if any uninspired man had composed it in order to put it among the canonical books, he would doubtless have often spoken of God, that men might thereby be the more moved to recognize his book for divine. If I am asked, whence it comes that the name of God is not in it, I own that I know nothing about it, for the reasons which are alleged do not satisfy me.

"2. It will be said that if the Holy Spirit has inspired the apostles with what they wrote, they would have spoken in a different manner. But this argument only affects those who will that the Holy Spirit dictated all the words. Besides, who does not know that God, to accommodate himself to our weakness, sometimes speaks the language of men?

"3. It is objected that it was not necessary for God to have

---

<sup>f</sup> Clem. 1 *ad Cor.*; Just. M., *Apol.*, ii.; Clem. Alex., *Exhort. ad G.*; *Strom.*, lib. vi. vii.; Orig., *cont. Cels.*, lib. 5; Euseb., *Præp. Evan.*, 13, 14; Ambr., *Ep.* 8 *ad Just.*; Chrysos., *Hom.* 37 *in Gen.*

given by inspiration things which concern natural truths, because the end of Scripture is to instruct us in religion. But I deny that this was unnecessary, for it would not have been worthy of the Spirit of God, that there should be falsehoods mingled with truths. Unbelievers would have thence taken occasion to doubt of all.

"4. It is said that the apostles often contradict themselves; but this is false, and it is not difficult to harmonize the pretended contradictions which men think they find in the books of the blessed disciples of the Lord Jesus.

"5. It is said that the ancient Church seemed to pay more honour to the Gospels than to the Epistles, because, say they, the reading of the Gospels was heard standing, whereas everybody might sit at the reading of the Epistles: and it is added that this distinction would not have been made if the Epistles had been believed as much inspired as the Gospels. But this inference cannot be drawn, because it is certain that Christians regarded the Epistles as inspired. I say nothing of the custom, the institution of which some have ascribed to Anastasius I., who died in the beginning of the fifth century; others to Siricius, who died in the year 398. It seems that the Christians wished to imitate the Jews, who believed they ought to shew more honour to the Law than to the Prophets, although they never doubted the inspiration of the Prophets.

"6. It is said that there is not much appearance that St. Paul was inspired when he so rudely treated the high priest (Acts xxiii. 3). Perhaps one can say that the apostles were not infallible in all they spoke, although they were in their writings.\* But Jesus Christ having promised to his disciples (Matt. x. 19, 20) that he would give them what they should speak, and that the Holy Spirit would speak in them, it would be better to answer that we do not see why St. Paul could not have strongly rebuked the man who commanded him to be smitten; like the old prophets, who reprov'd with much severity even the kings before whom they appeared. But, it will be said, if he had been inspired, would he not have known that he spoke to the high priest? Would not the Holy Spirit have taught him this? To this I answer, that it was by no means necessary for the Holy Spirit to make known to the apostles everything, as I have said elsewhere. But if I am asked how St. Paul could say he did not know the high priest, since he could not but know him? Some suppose he meant to say that he did not recognize Ananias

---

\* August., *Ep.* 82; lib. i., *De Consensu Evv.*, cap. 35; *Theod. Præf. in Psalm.*

for the true high priest because he had purchased the office, and Gamaliel had taught St. Paul that a judge who has paid money for his office is not a judge, and ought not to be honoured as a judge. But I confess that I believe we are to understand these words simply, that St. Paul did not know the high priest; either because in those times the high priests were often changed, and it had been some years since St. Paul was at Jerusalem; or because that, owing to the crowd, St. Paul could not perceive that the order to smite him proceeded from the mouth of the high priest; or because the high priest was mingled among the others without any mark of distinction; or because of some other reason of which we are unaware.

“7. It will be said that it appears the Jews did not regard the apostles as inspired, since they would not believe what Paul and Barnabas said to them: and this is why the council was convoked at Jerusalem, as recorded in Acts xv. But it is ridiculous to judge the apostles by what was thought of them by those who troubled the Church. If it pleased the Church at Antioch to send Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem, it is not because it doubted the authority of these two excellent servants of God, but to convince the Jews who doubted it; and it appears that God inspired these two apostles to go up to Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 2).”

6. FRANCIS TURRETIN.—“*Scriptura est syntagma librorum, per Spiritum Sanctum a viris Dei conscriptorum, de iis quæ homines ad Dei gloriam, et suam ipsorum salutem scire, credere, et agere necesse habent. . . . Spiritus Sanctus circa Scriptores Sacri hoc egit: 1. Eos ad adscribendum excitavit: nam acti fuerunt a Spiritu Sancto viri Dei (2 Pet. i. 21): 2. Verba inspiravit. Tota enim Scriptura est θεόπνευστος (2 Tim. iii. 16): 3. Ab omni errore conservavit: nam lac sincerum nobis propinârunt (1 Pet. ii. 2). . . . An Scriptores Sacri omnia, etiam minima verba scripserint instinctu Spiritus Sancti. Aff. contra Socin. Non quæritur, An Scriptores Sacri qua homines, simpliciter errare potuerint? Hoc enim facile concedimus. Seu an qua homines sacri acti a Spiritu Sancto reipsa errârint; hoc enim nemo, nisi plane Atheus dicet. Sed, An in scribendo ita acti et inspirati fuerunt a Spiritu Sancto et quoad res et quoad verba ut ab omni errore immunes fuerint, et Scripta ipsorum vere sint authentica et divina? quod defendimus.”<sup>a</sup>*

7. DR. DODDRIDGE.—“Any supernatural influence of God

---

<sup>a</sup> Franc. Turretini *Compend. Theol.*; Loc. 2 de Scriptura. Ed. 1695.

upon the mind of a rational creature, whereby he is formed to any degree of intellectual improvements, to which he could not or would not in fact have attained in present circumstances in a natural way, is called in general, *Divine Inspiration*.

"That is called in general an *inspiration of superintendency*, in which God does so influence and direct the mind of any person, as to keep him more secure from error in various and complex discourse, than he would have been merely by the use of his natural faculties.

"1. A book may be written without any error at all, where yet there is no superintendent inspiration, if the nature of the subject and the genius of the man be such as to be capable of such a composition.

"2. A book may be written by assistance of such an inspiration, in which there are some errors, provided they be fewer than in a course of nature must have been expected.

"*Plenary superintendent inspiration* is such a degree of inspiration, as excludes any mixture of error at all from the performance so superintended.

"1. A book, the contents of which are entirely true, may be said to be written by a plenary superintendent inspiration, even though there are many things contained in it, the truth of which might have been known and recorded without such extraordinary assistance, if there are others which could not; or if, on the whole, a freedom from all error would not otherwise have been found there.

"2. A book may be written by such a superintendent inspiration in which there are many imperfections of style and method, provided the whole contents of it be true, and the subject of it so important as would make it consistent with the divine wisdom thus to interpose to preserve that entire credibility.

"*An inspiration of elevation* is said to take place, where the faculties act in a regular and (as it may seem) in a common manner, yet are raised to an extraordinary degree; and that the composure shall, upon the whole, have more of the true sublime, or pathetic, than natural genius could have given.

"1. In many cases, it may be impossible to judge how far this inspiration may take place, since it is so difficult to know how far natural genius may extend, or how far corporeal causes may work upon the animal frame, so as to produce a performance greatly above the common standard.

"2. There may be such an inspiration as this, where there is none of superintendency, and much less any that is plenary.

"*Inspiration of suggestion* takes place when the use of the



faculties is superseded, and God does as it were speak directly to the mind, making such discoveries to it as it could not otherwise have obtained, and dictating the very words in which such discoveries are to be communicated, if they are meant as a message to others.

"1. There may be a plenary superintendency where there is neither the inspiration of elevation nor suggestion.

"2. Where there is an inspiration of suggestion, we may depend upon the certain truth of what is so suggested; for it is not to be imagined that God would dictate or declare a falsehood to any of his creatures, considering the veracity of his own nature. And we may also conclude there will be a plenary superintendency of direction in reporting it if such superintendency be necessary to the exactness of that report; for it seems inconsistent with the divine wisdom to suppose that God would suffer an inspired person to err through natural infirmity in delivering a message with which he has been pleased so expressly to charge him. . . . [After some further remarks and testimonies of early fathers as to the inspiration of the New Testament, this writer observes]:—

"1. It seems to have been the judgment of many of these persons, that the New Testament was written by a plenary superintendent inspiration at least.

"2. It is evident that in many of these passages they declare not only their own private sentiments, but those of the whole Church; and it is certain that their allowing any book to be, as they expressed it, 'canonical,' was in effect owning its plenary inspiration, since that word imported a rule of faith and manners from whence there was no human appeal.

"a. Some passages have been brought on the other side of the question from Jerome, who seems indeed to allow that the apostles were subject to some slips of memory . . . .

"The New Testament was written by a superintendent inspiration." (After stating some reasons for this, he continues):—

"From hence we may certainly infer that the apostles were not left in their writings to misrepresent any important facts on which the evidence of Christianity was founded, or any important doctrine upon which the salvation or edification of their converts depended.

"1. It is a controversy of considerable difficulty and importance, whether the inspiration and superintendency under which the apostles were, extended to every minute circumstance in their writings, so as to be in the most absolute sense plenary. Jerome, Grotius, Erasmus, and Episcopius, thought it was not, and Lowth himself allows that in matters of no consequence (as

he expresses it) they might be liable to slips of memory. But, on the contrary, it seems evident that the emphatical manner in which our Lord speaks of the agency of the Spirit upon them, and in which they themselves speak of their own writings, will justify us in believing that their inspiration was plenary, unless there be very convincing evidence brought on the other side to prove that it was not; and it is to be remembered, that if we allow there were some errors in the New Testament as it came from the hands of the apostles, there may be great danger of subverting the main purpose and design of it; since there will be endless room to debate the importance both of facts and doctrines."

[After these passages, the following objections are stated and discussed. 1. The conduct of St. Paul, Acts xxiii. 1—6, compared with Matt. x. 19, 20. 2. The apostles did not seem to regard each other as inspired, cf. Acts xv., and Gal. ii. 2—4; nor did Christians consider them infallible, Acts xi. 2, 3; xxi. 20—24. 3. St. Paul's language, in 2 Cor. xi. 5; 12, 11, compared with 1 Cor. vii. 10, 12, 25, 40; 2 Cor. xi. 17. 4. The Evangelists contradict one another in the accounts of Christ's genealogy, last passover, sufferings, and resurrection. 5. Erroneous quotations from the Old Testament in the New. 6. The apostles not only misquote but misapply Old Testament texts, e.g., in Matt. i. 23; ii. 15, 18, 23; viii. 17; xxvii. 9, 10; Gal. iii. 16. For the solution of these objections we must refer to the original, *Lectures on Pneumatology, Ethics, and Divinity*. By Dr. Doddridge. Edition 1763. Lect. 137—140; pp. 322—334. The same principles in a more developed and connected form are laid down in the *Dissertation on the Inspiration of the New Testament*, by the same author, forming one of the Appendixes to the *Family Expositor*.]

8. ABBE BERGIER.—"Wherein consists the inspiration of these books? A new question whereupon unbelievers do not cease to insist. Are we obliged to believe that God revealed immediately to the sacred authors all that they wrote; that he suggested to them the style, the expressions, the terms, of which they made use? The Church has never so decided.

"Without doubt God revealed to the sacred authors what it was impossible for them to know by natural light and by human researches; such are future events, above all, those which depend immediately upon divine power and wisdom: the prophets could not know and declare them but by revelation. Doctrines and morals were revealed to them in this sense, that they held them by a certain tradition which ascended to the first revelation made to Adam and the patriarchs. It was the same with facts

of which no man had been witness, such as the creation. We also admit an immediate revelation for everything which Moses and the prophets formally assert they received from the mouth of God himself.

"It is not necessary to refer to such a revelation those historical facts of which the sacred writers may have had a knowledge, either themselves, or through well-informed witnesses. It is enough that God excited them to write, by a supernatural movement of his grace, for us to be able to say with truth that they did it by inspiration.

"We believe, in fine, that God watched over them, and gave them the assistance of his Spirit to preserve them from all error in doctrine and morals. These three helps supposed, it is true to say that what was written by these authors is the Word of God, and that we owe to their books entire submission of heart and mind.

"If some ancient or modern theologians have pushed the inspiration of the sacred books beyond this, their opinion constitutes no rule; there is no law or decision of the Church which forces us to adopt it."<sup>i</sup>

[The above quoted author has an article on the Divinity or Inspiration of the books of the New Testament (vol. viii., p. 218), comprising four sections. 1. This inspiration proved by the authority of the Church. 2. What was thought of it in the third century. 3. In the second century. 4. Equality between the books of the Old Testament and of the New. 5. Wherein their inspiration consists. Although involving some repetitions of what has been already said in the quotation preceding, the last of these sections is worth translating.]

"This point of fact once proved, that from the age of the apostles it has been believed constantly and universally in the Church that the books of the New Testament were inspired, as well as those of the Old Testament, we have no more need to discuss the opinion of Le Clerc, who pretends that this inspiration is not necessary to prove the divinity of Christianity, and to render our faith certain.<sup>j</sup> Be it necessary or not necessary, it is not for us to decide. If the Church has believed this inspiration from the time of the apostles, it is a revealed dogma, therefore it is necessary to believe it. God has willed that it should be a dogma of belief, inasmuch as the Church has never ceased to regard it as such.

"To render it ridiculous, the author supposes that according

<sup>i</sup> *Traité de la Vraie Religion.* By the Abbé Bergier. Ed. 1785. Vol. v., pp. 332, 333.

<sup>j</sup> *Sentimens de quelques Theol. de Hollande.* Lett. xi.

to us, God inspired the sacred writers not only with the dogmas, the morals, and the prophecies, but also the style, phrases, and words of which they made use. The Church has never canonized this sentiment as an article of faith, and has never condemned the contrary opinion.

"1. According to the common opinion, God *revealed* to the sacred writers what they could not know by the light of nature; but this revelation was not necessary for the facts of which they had been eye-witnesses, or which they had learned from the mouth of such witnesses. The lessons of Jesus Christ are an express *revelation* made to the apostles and disciples who heard him preach.

"2. God *inspired* them by a movement of his grace, with the design and will to put in writing what they knew by revelation, or otherwise.

"3. He gave them *assistance*, or special aid, to preserve them from error or unfaithfulness in their recital, yet without at all changing the degree of natural capacity that each writer might have for writing more or less correctly, more or less clearly.

"These three conditions are necessary; but sufficient for us to be bound to have faith in their writings without any danger of error, and to regard them as the Word of God. We are not prodigal of miracles here.

"The principal objection of Le Clerc, against the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, is drawn from the contradictions into which the sacred writers have fallen, and the maledictions in which they have indulged. We formally deny these contradictions, and we defy all unbelievers to produce any one which it is not possible to reconcile. As for the maledictions, we have shewn in our second part, that they are prophecies or menaces, and not desires dictated by revenge. . . .

"The author of the *Histoire Critique de Jésus Christ* has repeated and amplified the false accusation of Le Clerc. 'By the simple inspection of the Gospel,' says he, 'every Christian ought to be convinced that this book is divine, that every word which it contains is inspired by the Holy Ghost. The sentiment of the majority of divines is, that the Holy Spirit revealed to the sacred writers the very spelling of the words, the very points and commas. But who will warrant us that all the copyists and monks of the ages of ignorance, who have transmitted to us the revealed writings, have made no blunder in transcribing them? A point or a comma misplaced suffices, as we know, totally to alter the sense of a passage.'<sup>k</sup>

---

<sup>k</sup> *Hist. Crit. de J. C.*, Pref., p. iv.

"It is thus that theologians are rendered contemptible and odious by calumnies. We shall not take the trouble to refute them more at length. It is the Church which guarantees us the preservation, integrity, authenticity, and true sense of the holy books, and not the capacity of copyists."

9. RICHARD SIMON.—"We must not, under the pretence of such inspiration, combat reason and experience. They are men who have been the instruments of God, and who have not ceased to be men in order to become prophets. The Holy Spirit guided them in such a way that they were never deceived in what they wrote; but we must not therefore believe that there is nothing in their expressions but what is divine and supernatural. . . . The Calvinists accuse the Arminians of agreeing with the Socinians, and of only considering the sacred books to be like other works, save that they were written with all possible fidelity and exactness. . . . It cannot be denied that Grotius, who was one of the most learned and judicious interpreters of Scripture, maintained that of all the books of the Bible, none but the prophetic were inspired. He asserts that it is not necessary for histories to be dictated by the Holy Spirit. Spinoza also followed this opinion, and recently the author of two letters printed in the book entitled, *Opinions of certain Theologians of Holland upon the critical History of the Old Testament*. . . . Our theologians are agreed that the whole Pentateuch was inspired, but the most learned among them make no difficulty in recognizing that what Moses wrote of the creation of the world, of the genealogies of the first patriarchs, and other things which preceded him, may have been derived from memoirs which those patriarchs had left."<sup>1</sup>

"The church assembled in councils has the same inspiration as the judges of the Sanhedrim had in their assemblies; for it has what is called a grace of infallibility in its decisions, and no other inspiration or prophecy is ascribed to the Sanhedrim. . . . It is not true, that the Jews have recognized no inspiration in their republic since the reign of Artaxerxes, as it is easy to shew by their books. . . . The Jewish doctors and the fathers recognize an inspiration in the judges of the Sanhedrim. . . . In regard to the inspiration of the sacred books, a distinction has been made between things and words, and it has been professed that it was needless to extend it to the words or to the style of each sacred author; that it was enough that things were inspired.

---

<sup>1</sup> *L'Inspiration des Livres Sacres*. Par le Prieur de Bolleville (Father Simon). Rotterdam: 1699.

This is the sentiment of the ancient fathers and of sundry Catholic doctors. But Mr. N. has equally attacked the inspiration of words and of things, restricting it for things to prophecy alone; and this has been combated as a doctrine opposed to all tradition, as well among Jews as Christians. If any have wished to extend this inspiration to the words, it is not right that we should follow them in their ideas, which have no foundation in antiquity. . . . It has been said (by M. Simon) that a book, whether it contains a true history or a simple parable, or a history mingled with parables, is not on that account less canonical. In effect, if we suppose, for example, that there are some fictions in the Book of Job, it will be none the less divine, having been written by an inspired author. . . . The Apostles were not prophets, but ministers of Jesus Christ, to make known his Gospel, and to whom he had promised his Spirit that they might always say the truth; and it is in this principally that their inspiration consists."<sup>m</sup>

10. LOUIS LE BLANC.—“Scripta illa arte humana elaborata non sunt, verum a Deo inspirata, ut hoc in loco testatur apostolus, dum Timotheo dicit *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, ‘omnis,’ vel ‘tota Scriptura divinitus inspirata est.’ Etenim libros illos quos tanquam divinos et sacros veneramus, scripserunt quidem homines nostri similes et *ὁμοιοπαθεῖς*, verum id non fecerunt proprio motu atque consilio, et ex animi sui quadam electione, sed instinctu et motu divino, Spiritu Sancto, videlicet, illos extra ordinem ad scribendum movente et singulari quadam ratione impellente. Nam ut testatur Petrus posteriori Epistola, ‘non voluntate humana allata est olium prophetia, sed acti a Spiritu Sancto locuti sunt sancti Dei homines.’ Ubi de prophetia Scripturæ eum loqui totus loci contextus arguit. Præterea quæ continent isti libri sunt ut plurimum dogmata et mysteria quædam quæ non invenit et excogitavit ingenium humanum, sed quæ scriptoribus sacris supernaturali quodam modo innotuerunt, Deo, scilicet, intus revelante et illuminante, aut etiam exterius mirabili quadam ratione docente. Sic Dei Filius ipse *αὐτοπροσώπως* discipulos suos docuit mysteria regni cælorum. Et Paulus post Christi resurrectionem Apostolis additus, capite primo Epistolæ ad Galatas testatur ‘se Evangelium suum ab homine non accepisse, neque didicisse, sed per revelationem Jesu Christi.’ Et prophetæ similiter illa quæ scriptis mandabant prius afflante Dei Spiritu perceperant, aut ab angelis Dei nuntiis acce-

<sup>m</sup> *Réponse au Livre intitulé Défense des Sentimens, etc.* Par le Prieur de Bolleville (Father Simon), *passim*.

perant. Quod spectat autem varias historias quæ in Scriptura Sacra reperiuntur, idem ille Dei Spiritus est qui fecit earum delectum, quique mentem et calamum authorum Sacrorum direxit ut scripto redigerent quas judicavit ipse maxime idoneas ad Ecclesiæ consolationem et institutionem. Quinimo Scripturæ phrasæ et verba ipsa hominibus non debent, sed Spiritui Sancto, qui scriptoribus sacris non tantum res ipsas suggessit, sed etiam idonea verba quibus illas enuntiarent, quique adeo manu prophetarum et apostolorum scribebat, sicut ore illorum loquebatur, juxta quod dicit Christus apud Matthæum alloquens discipulos suos, Nolite cogitare quid aut quomodo, etc. (Matt. x. 19, 20). Unde est etiam quod Paulus de mysteriis Evangelii loquens (1 Cor. ii. 13), dicit se ea loqui non sermonibus quos docet, humana sapientia, sed quos docet Spiritus Sanctus. . . . Non tantum tractat illa (Scriptura) res divinas, sed tractat etiam modo plane divino, nempe, verbis quæ non selegit homo, sed quæ dictavit ipse Dei Spiritus, et ordine quem non mens hominum adinvenit, sed qui ad Deum ipsum ut authorem referendus est. Ac proinde in reliquis omnibus scriptis, quantum libet pia et sancta sint, semper est aliquid humani, et homines merito eorum authores censentur et dicuntur. Verum in hac Scriptura nihil est nisi Divinum, nec alium quam Deum authorem habet. Nam quod spectat prophetas, apostolos, et Evangelistas, quorum manu et calamo Deus usus est in illa Ecclesiæ tradenda, ejus authores proprie non fuerunt sed scriptores solummodo. Nec fere quicquam amplius hac in re ipsius tribuendum quam amanuensi vel scribæ cui dictat vir doctus opus quod ipse composuit, cujusque solus agnoscitur author, quamvis alterius penna vel stylo in lucem edatur. . . . Libri sacri ab omni prorsus errore sunt immunes, et per se fidem exigunt et merentur. Ac proinde sufficit ut aliquid affirmant ut pleno cum fidei obsequio suscipiatur. Estque eorum simplex testimonium qualibet ratione et demonstratione firmius. Idque quoniam sunt ipsius Dei opus, ac in totum procedunt ab illo Spiritu veritatis qui nec falli nec fallere potest.”

11. WILLIAM NICHOLS, D.D.—“Now I do not think, that every particular expression, word, and letter were dictated by the Holy Ghost; so that the Apostles were nothing but the bare amanuenses to the Holy Ghost, and that they had no more share in the composition, than my servant has, when I dictate a

” *De Script. Sac. Div. Orig.*; *Oratio habita Sedani*, an. 1660. By L. Le Blanc. London: 1683. Appended to the *Theses Theologicæ* of the same author.

letter for him to write. For this does not seem consistent with the nature of the divine operations, which do not usually put such a force upon human nature, they acting in such a way as is agreeable to their rational faculties. But if the Holy Ghost should have dictated to the Apostles after that rate, they had been only pure organs to the Holy Ghost, and perfect machines for him to work upon, without any manner of exercise of their own faculties. Therefore it is most probable, that God Almighty dealt with them more like rational creatures; which was by letting their minds have some share in this divine work. It is more agreeable to reason to think, that he suggested those divine thoughts first to their minds, and ordinarily left them to weigh them in their thoughts, as they did other truths, and to put them into what expressions their fancies were naturally inclined to use; still presiding over them, and keeping them from expressing anything contrary to the divine mind, or to the dignity of the sacred subject. And it is farther evident, that the Apostles (as the prophets heretofore) had some share in the expression at least; for otherwise there is no account to be given of the different styles of these persons, which varied according to their tempers and education. For if the Holy Ghost had been the sole author of every expression, the style of every book in Scripture had been uniformly alike; or however there would not have been that difference found, as now there is, and which may be ascribed to natural causes. If the Holy Ghost had dictated every word, why should Isaiah, who was bred in a court, be more florid and magnificent than Amos, who had his education among the herd? Why should St. Luke, who had a polite education, write his books in better Greek, and more agreeable to the Greek and Latin histories, than St. John? Why should St. Paul, who was brought up among the rabbins, discover more of Jewish learning and rabbinical reasoning than the other Apostles? Why should St. John, above all the others, discover in his writings so much sweetness of nature, and so much love and tenderness, if it was not in some measure owing to his natural temper? These are undeniable arguments, that the Apostles had some share in their divine compositions, and that they varied their expressions, and in some measure modelled their thoughts, according to these qualifications.

“But then we must own, that the chiefest part of the sense was inspired by God. He suggested to their mind those divine truths which they revealed to the world, either when they were writing, or if they had learned them before, by refreshing their memories, and taking care that they added or omitted nothing that was material. It is an impossible, as well as a very need-



less thing, for us to discover, how far the divine Spirit interested himself in inspiring the Apostles, and to tell exactly what in their compositions was owing to reason, and what to inspiration. It is sufficient to say, that the Holy Ghost afforded all the assistance which was necessary to make theirs to be infallible writings. Therefore we may be sure, that the assistance was more or less, according as the subject which they wrote of required. When they wrote historically of matters of fact, which they themselves had seen, or which had been reported to them by credible witnesses, there was no reason that the substance of this history should be revealed to them again; it was then sufficient only to have their memories refreshed, as our Saviour had promised them, and that the Holy Ghost should so far inspect them, as that they might not be guilty of any error in the relation. Where any new divine truths are delivered by them, which were not taught them by Christ when he was upon earth, there it is necessary to assert that the whole of those were immediately inspired into their minds by the Holy Ghost; because such truths could not be the result of their human understanding or reasoning, nor yet the treasure of their memory; and therefore these could come into their minds no other way but by inspiration. And as for other things which may be found in their books, such as reasoning and arguing from revealed truths, that which is most rational to think in this point is this: That the Holy Ghost suffered them to make use of their reasoning faculties, as far as the arguments were suitable and solid, at the same time quickening their invention, and clearing their judgment, and hindering them from writing anything, which might be illogical or impertinent.

“But then I farther add, that the inspiration of the Holy Ghost sometimes proceeded so far as to inspire the very words and ways of expression. I observed to you before, that it was very probable, that the word *all* was inserted in the Gospel of St. Matthew by the particular direction of the Holy Ghost, in the relation of the institution of the Lord's Supper, ‘Drink ye all of this’ (Matt. xxvi. 27): and so Mark xiv. 23, ‘And they all drank of it.’ Now it is not reasonable to think, that these two Evangelists inserted the word *all* by chance; for it is not a very usual way of speaking, and we see it is omitted in the relation of the delivery of the bread; and therefore must be intended by the Holy Ghost for some farther end; which is, to shew that all the communicants have a right to the cup, which he foresaw in future ages would be by some sacrilegiously denied them. And so it is not to be doubted, but that the Holy Ghost did particularly direct them, in some seeming accidental expressions,

which he ordered them to use; that Christians might have thereby evident proofs from God's Word, for several principal articles of the Christian faith; such as the doctrines of the divinity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, of justification and satisfaction, etc. Many good arguments for which are drawn from some particular expressions in Scripture; which would have been wanting for the support of these Christian truths, if the Holy Ghost had given the sacred writers leave to have expressed those passages otherways."<sup>o</sup>

12. Dr. BEATTIE.—“Some are at a loss to reconcile the inspiration of the Evangelists with those particulars wherein their Gospels seem to differ from one another. They do not all record the same things, nor do they all relate the same events in the same manner. The differences are indeed minute; but they are perceptible. How could this be, if the historians were inspired? The following answer to this query is submitted to the reader.

“Socrates long ago observed, that man has no need of supernatural information concerning those things which his natural faculties are alone sufficient to discover. To enable the Apostles to comprehend all evangelical truth, supernatural light was necessary. Their master accordingly promised it, and on the day of Pentecost, or soon after, they received it. I say, or soon after, because subsequent to the descent of the Holy Spirit on that day, a particular revelation, relating to the conversion of the Gentiles, was made to Peter, and the whole scheme of the Gospel, as well as its miraculous gifts and graces, communicated to Paul by immediate inspiration. After this we find, that in their doctrine they lay claim to infallibility in pretty strong terms. On some extraordinary emergencies too, in the course of their ministry, as in the case of their being arraigned before kings and rulers, it was promised, that they should receive aid from heaven in making their defence.

“But inspiration was not necessary to enable them to see and hear; or to teach them how to conduct themselves in the common business of life. After their conversion, we have no reason to think that John was a more expert fisherman, or Luke a more skilful physician, than before. As historians, therefore, they need not, I presume, be considered in any other light than that of honest men, recording what they saw and heard, and had examined, and were competent judges of, and

---

<sup>o</sup> *Conference with a Theist, etc.* Vol. ii., pp. 65—68. Third edition. London: 1723.

deeply interested in : for, on this supposition, their testimony is fully sufficient to establish the truth of the Gospel. And this may account for their not all recording the same things, nor describing the same events in exactly the same way.

“If John, for example, saw his master do, or heard him say, what Matthew did not see or hear, which might have happened in a hundred instances, it was equally natural for the former to record, and for the latter not to record it. And if Matthew and Mark, supposed to have been spectators of the crucifixion, were so stationed in the crowd as to hear the one robber revile their dying Lord, and to see the other move his lips, but without hearing what he said, it was not unnatural for them to conclude, as the combination against him seemed now to be universal, that both the robbers reviled him ; which yet Luke, or some other person from whom Luke received his information, might, by being more advantageously situated, and hearing the words of the penitent robber, know to be true of only one of them. At any rate, we may with confidence affirm, that if the Evangelists had been to invent a fable, and obtrude it on the world for truth, they would have taken care that there should be no such difference in their testimonies, as there confessedly is in this instance : which, however, is not so important, as either to detract from the veracity of the historians, or throw any blemish on the purity of the Gospel.

“The same thing may be said of our Lord’s genealogy, as it is differently stated by Matthew and Luke. If either account had been false, both would not have existed. Both therefore are true : and may be reconciled, by supposing the one to be the genealogy of his mother, and the other that of his reputed father. In the most material articles they agree ; namely, that he was descended from Abraham, and of the family of David. And it is impossible to imagine any motive that could induce either Luke or Matthew to misrepresent the subsequent articles ; as among a people so curious in genealogy as the Jews were, the error might be so easily found out.

“When the matter inquired into is very complex, an exact coincidence in the testimony of witnesses is not expected. Let them be ever so attentive and candid, they could not have stood all in the same place, nor consequently have taken notice of the very same particulars without variation. Of some sorts of facts, too, the memory of some men is more tenacious than that of others. One remembers best what he saw, another what he heard : one attends to the connection of events with their effects and causes ; another rather considers them separately, and as each event is in itself. Hence, as formerly observed, some

diversities in what they declare, concerning circumstances of little moment, would convey a favourable opinion of the veracity of witnesses; whereas a perfect sameness of declaration might, in the case supposed, breed suspicion of a preconceived plan.

“But though, after the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, the Apostles laid claim to infallibility of doctrine, they never gave out that their whole conduct was under the guidance of inspiration. They were indeed holy men; but still they were men; and, as such, liable both to sins of infirmity, which they humbly acknowledge, and from which they affirm that no man is free, and also to error, not in doctrine indeed, but in those matters of less moment, in which they had nothing but their own reason to direct them. ‘If we say we have no sin,’ says St. John, ‘we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.’ ‘We are men of like passions with you,’ said Paul and Barnabas, when the people of Lystris were preparing to pay them divine honours. And here, let me ask, in passing, whether these two Apostles, if they had been impostors, or wished to gain undue influence over the minds of men, would have been so zealous in refusing those honours, and so anxious to convert that people from idolatry. And let me ask further, with respect to the Apostles in general, whether, if ambition, or vanity, or any other principle than the love of truth, had been the motive of their conduct, they would so uniformly, and with such solemnity of protestation, have ascribed all the glory of their miracles and doctrine, not to themselves, but to their crucified Lord.”<sup>p</sup>

13. THOMAS SCOTT.—“By the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, I mean ‘Such an immediate and complete discovery, by the Holy Spirit to the minds of the sacred writers, of those things which could not have been otherwise known; and such an effectual superintendence, as to those matters which they might be informed of by other means; as entirely preserved them from error, in every particular, which could in the least affect any of the doctrines or precepts contained in their books.’ Every proposition, therefore, is to be considered as ‘the sure testimony of God,’ in that sense according to which it is proposed as truth. Those facts occurred and those words were spoken, as to the import of them, and the instruction to be deduced from them, which there stand recorded: but we must judge concerning the morality of men’s actions, and the truth of their sentiments, by the preceptive and doctrinal parts of the

---

<sup>p</sup> *Evidences of the Christian Religion, etc.* By James Beattie, LL.D. Fourth Edition. London: 1795.

Scriptures. Nor does it at all invalidate the complete inspiration of the sacred writers, to allow that they expressed themselves in common language, and wrote of things as men generally spoke of them: rather than according to philosophical exactness, or in the style that was used in the schools of the learned during the ages in which they lived. Supposed or unimportant errors, or inaccuracies of expression, in such things, are not in the least inconsistent with that entire divine inspiration of which we speak; for the Scriptures were not written to render us exact philosophers, or to instruct us in ancient history and geography, but to 'make us wise unto salvation.' Nor do the few immaterial mistakes, which in a long course of years have crept in, through the errors of transcribers, create any difficulty or uncertainty to the humble and teachable enquirer: though they frequently give occasion to the self-sufficient to cavil and object; for 'the Lord taketh the wise in their own craftiness.'"<sup>4</sup>

14. BISHOP TOMLINE.—“When it is said that Scripture is divinely inspired, it is not to be understood that God suggested every word, or dictated every expression. It appears from the different styles in which the books are written, and from the different manner in which the same events are related and predicted by different authors, that the sacred penmen were permitted to write as their several tempers, understandings, and habits of life directed; and that the knowledge communicated to them by inspiration upon the subject of their writings, was applied in the same manner as any knowledge acquired by ordinary means. Nor is it to be supposed that they were even thus inspired in every fact which they related, or in every precept which they delivered. They were left to the common use of their faculties, and did not upon every occasion stand in need of supernatural communication; but whenever, and as far as divine assistance was necessary, it was always afforded. In different parts of Scripture we perceive that there were different sorts and degrees of inspiration: God enabled Moses to give an account of the creation of the world; he enabled Joshua to record with exactness the settlement of the Israelites in the land of Canaan; he enabled David to mingle prophetic information with the varied effusions of gratitude, contrition, and piety; he enabled Solomon to deliver wise instructions for the regulation of human life; he enabled Isaiah to deliver predictions concerning the future Saviour of mankind, and Ezra to collect the sacred

---

<sup>4</sup> *Essays on the most important subjects in Religion.* By Thomas Scott (the Commentator).

Scriptures into one authentic volume; 'but all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man severally as he will' (1 Cor. xii. 11). In some cases inspiration only produced correctness and accuracy in relating past occurrences, or in reciting the words of others; in other cases it communicated ideas not only new and unknown before, but infinitely beyond the reach of unassisted human intellect; and sometimes inspired prophets delivered predictions for the use of future ages, which they did not themselves comprehend, and which cannot be fully understood till they are accomplished. But whatever distinctions we may make with respect to the sorts, degrees, or modes of inspiration, we may rest assured that there is one property which belongs to every inspired writing, namely, that it is free from error—I mean material error;—and this property must be considered as extending to the whole of each of those writings, of which a part only is inspired; for we cannot suppose that God would suffer any such errors as might tend to mislead our faith or pervert our practice, to be mixed with those truths which he himself has mercifully revealed to his rational creatures as the means of their eternal salvation. In this restricted sense it may be asserted, that the sacred writers always wrote under the influence, or guidance, or care of the Holy Spirit, which sufficiently establishes the truth and divine authority of all Scripture.

“These observations relative to the nature of inspiration are particularly applicable to the historical books of the Old Testament. That the authors of these books were occasionally inspired is certain, since they frequently display an acquaintance with the counsels and designs of God, and often reveal his future dispensations in the clearest predictions. But though it is evident that the sacred historians sometimes wrote under the immediate operation of the Holy Spirit, it does not follow that they derived from revelation the knowledge of those things which might be collected from the common sources of human intelligence. It is sufficient to believe, that by the general superintendence of the Holy Spirit, they were directed in the choice of their materials, enlightened to judge of the truth and importance of those accounts from which they borrowed their information, and prevented from registering any material error. The historical books appear, indeed, from internal evidence, to have been chiefly written by persons contemporary with the periods to which they relate; who, in their description of characters and events, many of which they witnessed, uniformly exhibit a strict sincerity of intention, and an unexampled impartiality. Some of these books, however, were compiled in sub-

sequent times from the sacred annals mentioned in Scripture as written by prophets or seers, and from those public records, and other authentic documents, which though written by uninspired men, were held in high estimation, and preserved with great care by persons specially appointed as keepers of the genealogies and public archives of the Jewish nation. To such well-known chronicles we find the sacred writers not unfrequently referring for a more minute detail of those circumstances which they omit as inconsistent with their design. For 'these books are to be considered as the histories of revelations, as commentaries upon the prophecies, and as affording a lively sketch of the economy of God's government of his selected people. They were not designed as national annals, to record every minute particular and political event that occurred; but they are rather a compendious selection of such remarkable occurrences and operations as were best calculated to illustrate the religion of the Hebrew nation; to set before that perverse and ungrateful people an abstract of God's proceedings, of their interests and duties; as also to furnish posterity with an instructive picture of the divine attributes, and with a model of that dispensation on which a nobler and more spiritual government was to be erected; and moreover, to place before mankind the melancholy proofs of that corruption, which had been entailed upon them, and to exhibit in the depravity of a nation highly favoured, miraculously governed, and instructed by inspired teachers, the necessity of that redemption and renewal of righteousness which was so early and so repeatedly promised by the prophets. It seems probable, therefore, that the Books of Kings and Chronicles do not contain a complete compilation of the entire works of each contemporary prophet, but are rather an abridgement of their several labours, and of other authentic public writings, digested by Ezra after the captivity, with an intention to display the sacred history under one point of view; and hence it is that that they contain some expressions which evidently result from contemporary description, and others which as clearly argue them to have been composed long after the occurrences which they relate.'—(Gray).

"Since then we are taught to consider the divine assistance as ever proportioned to the real wants of men; and since it must be granted that their natural faculties, though wholly incompetent to the prediction of future events, are adequate to the relation of such past occurrences as have fallen within the sphere of their own observation, we may infer that the historical books are not written with the same uniform inspiration, which illumines every page of the prophetic writings. But at the same

time we are to believe that God vouchsafed to guard these registers of his judgments and his mercies from all important mistakes; and to impart, by supernatural means, as much information and assistance to those who composed them, as was requisite for the accomplishment of the great designs of his providence. In the ancient Hebrew canon they were placed, as has been already observed, in the class of prophetic books; they are cited as such by the evangelical writers; and it must surely be considered as a strong testimony to the constant opinion of the Jews respecting the inspiration of these books, that they have never dared to annex any historical narrative to them since the death of Malachi. They closed the sacred volume when the succession of prophets ceased.

"If it be asked by what rule we are to distinguish the inspired from the uninspired parts of these books, I answer, that no general rule can be prescribed for that purpose. Nor is it necessary that we should be able to make any such discrimination. It is enough for us to know, that every writer of the Old Testament was inspired, and that the whole of the history it contains, without any exception or reserve, is true. These points being ascertained and allowed, it is of very little consequence whether the knowledge of a particular fact was obtained by any of the ordinary modes of information, or whether it was communicated by immediate revelation from God; whether any particular passage was written by the natural powers of the historian, or whether it was written by the positive suggestion of the Holy Spirit.

"We may in like manner suppose, that some of the precepts delivered in the books called *Hagiographa*, were written without any supernatural assistance, though it is evident that others of them exceed the limits of human wisdom; and it would be equally impossible, as in the historical Scriptures, to ascertain the character of particular passages which might be proposed. But here again a discrimination would be entirely useless. The books themselves furnish sufficient proofs that the writers of them were occasionally inspired; and we know also, that they were frequently quoted, particularly the Psalms, as prophetic, by our Saviour and his Apostles, in support of the religion which they preached. Hence we are under an indispensable obligation to admit the divine authority of the whole of these books, which have the same claim to our faith and obedience as if they had been written under the influence of a constant and universal inspiration.

"But whatever uncertainty there may be concerning the direct inspiration of any historical narrative, or of any moral



precept, contained in the Old Testament, we must be fully convinced that all its prophetic parts proceeded from God.”<sup>r</sup>

[The same author returns to the subject in part ii., chap. 1, where he adds to his own observations copious extracts from an essay by the Rev. W. Parry, *An Enquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Apostles, etc.* Dr. Henderson, in his work on *Divine Inspiration*, gives in his notes the title of this and a considerable number of other treatises upon the subject.]

To the preceding extracts we here add a second series, collected from a single work by Father Simon, from whom we have already quoted. It appears that the Jansenists, as represented by M. Arnauld, pleaded for plenary verbal inspiration. Whereupon M. Simon labours to shew that such was not by any means the uniform opinion in the church. He commences in the following manner. (We omit his comments in the passages which succeed this.)

“The eagerness of M. Arnauld to contradict all that he thinks comes from the Jesuits, has prevented him from reflecting sufficiently upon two kinds of inspiration commonly laid down by divines; the one is called express and immediate revelation; the other is named a special direction and assistance of the Holy Spirit. Cajetan, Melchior Canus, and a number of other learned writers, have expressly distinguished these two kinds of inspiration. Before going into a thorough examination of this matter, it is well to explain what is here understood by immediate revelation, and by special direction. Immediate revelation is when the Holy Spirit reveals in such a manner to the sacred writer what he writes, that this author does nothing but receive and give to us what the same Holy Spirit has dictated to him. It is thus that the prophets were inspired in regard to things future, which they learned immediately from God. This inspiration also takes place in regard to words, if it happen that the Holy Spirit suggests to a writer the words he employs.

“It is called special direction when the Holy Spirit does not reveal immediately to an author what he puts into writing, but only excites him to write what he knows already, having learned it in another way, or known by his own talents. If he assists and directs him in such a manner that he chooses only what is conformed to truth, and to the end for which the sacred books are composed, that is, to edify us in faith and charity. It is thus that St. Luke has written in Acts numerous things which he had learned from the apostles, and from those who had been

---

<sup>r</sup> *Introduction to the Study of the Bible.* By Bishop Tomline. pp. 15—20.

witnesses of them, such as the preaching and miracles of St. Peter: or which he had himself seen, as the coming of St. Paul to Malta. It was not absolutely necessary that such facts as he knew of himself should be revealed to him.

"This second kind of inspiration can also occur in regard to words, if we suppose (as doubtless we can), that the Holy Spirit having revealed the subjects to an author, leaves him to act in what concerns the manner of expressing them, assisting him nevertheless, and directing this natural manner so as to conform it to truth. It may be said that this inspiration is not properly immediate in regard to the matter which is supposed to be already known, but it is immediate in regard to the author, whom it incites, assists and directs in the use and arrangement of the ideas and knowledge which he already has. That which is written by such inspiration is truly divine, and it ought to be admitted that the Holy Spirit is the author of it. Because what is human in it, is involved in the special direction of the Holy Spirit.

"After this explanation, it may be asserted without any contradiction, that there is nothing in Scripture which is not of divine authority, which comes not immediately from God, and which is not his Word; and at the same time to say that all has not been immediately revealed. For it suffices that God be the author of all Scripture, and that it be his Word, for him to have moved the sacred writers to write, and for him to have always assisted them, either by an immediate revelation, or by a simple direction and special assistance, as we have already explained. Although I believe this opinion touching the inspiration of the sacred books to be very true, I cannot deny that the other sentiment is supported by a number of authorities. But after having well considered what is advanced on both sides, I have followed that which seems to me the best established."

[The author goes on to quote various passages from different writers explanatory of their views upon the subject. These quotations he gives in the Latin original as well as in a French translation. Some of the Latin extracts are as follows.]

1. From the Jesuits of Louvain in their Theses of 1586.

"Ut aliquid sit Scriptura Sacra non est necessarium singula ejus verba inspirata esse a Spiritu Sancto.

"Non est necessarium ut singulæ veritates et sententiæ sint immediate a Spiritu Sancto ipsi Scriptori inspiratæ."

2. From the Response to the censures of the Theologians of Louvain.

---

\* *Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du Nouv. Testament.* By Father Simon. Paris: 1695. Chap. iii.

“Evangelistæ ac alii Scriptores hagiographi ad ea scribenda quæ viderant, vel ab infallibilibus testibus audierant, non videntur eguisse nova revelatione illarum veritatum.

“Satis est ut Spiritus Sanctus eligat eos in suos amanuenses, et excitet peculiari instinctu ad scribenda ea quæ jam antea cognoverant, ac simul illis specialissimo modo assistat in omnibus verbis ac sententiis, ut ne minimum quidem errorem committere possint.”

3. From Cardinal Cajetan (born 1470; died 1534), *Commentary on Luke i.* 1528.

“Originem plenissimæ scientiæ declarat traditionem apostolicam: unde clare apparet Lucam scripsisse ex auditu ab Apostolis, et non revelatione sibi immediate facta, divina tamen gratia dirigente et servante ne in aliquo erraret.”

4. From Ferdinand o. Escalante, in *Clypeus Concionat.*

“Dico quibusdam scriptoribus sacris Deum non revelasse quæ scripturi essent, sed impulsu divino atque instinctu eos excitasse ut scriberent proprio sermone quæ viderant, legerant, audierant, per revelationem noverant.

“Patet igitur aliquos Scriptores sacros non accepisse a Deo quæ scripturi essent, per immediatam revelationem, propterea quod in edendis voluminibus suis tantopere insudarunt.

“Si materiam quam descripserunt non acceperint a Deo per revelationem, multo minus singula verba.”

[It may be observed here once for all, as necessarily modifying the views of Escalante and other writers of his communion, that they feel bound to devise a theory of inspiration which shall be reconciled with such statements as occur in the preface to *Ecclesiasticus*, and in the second book of *Maccabees*.]

5. From the theologians of Douay in their censures upon the *Theses* of the Louvain Jesuits above cited.

“Et sane si non est necessarium ut singulæ veritates et sententiæ quæ sunt in sacris litteris immediate sint a Spiritu Sancto ipsi scriptori inspiratæ, non modo sequetur indeterminabilis altercatio super sententiis immediate vel non immediate inspiratis, verum etiam de integris Evangeliiis quorum historia potuit humanitus esse nota; imo et de omnibus scripturis non propheticiis dubitabitur, an mediate Spiritus Sanctus eas scriptoribus inspiraverit.

6. From the work of Escalante, before cited.

“Quod non pertineat ad rationem formalem Scripturæ sacræ, esse a Deo suggerente, non solum res quas sacer scriptor scribere potest, sed etiam singula verba.

“Donum Spiritus Sancti circa materiam propositam trifariam potest considerari: *primo*, si Deus alicui ad scribendum

revelaverit, non res solum, verum etiam singula verba per lumen internum: 2. Si dignatus fuerit alicui pandere mysteria, non tamen ad ea exaranda verba suppeditaverit. 3. Si scriptori neque res scribendas aperuerit lumine superno, neque verba suggesserit, sed tantum excitaverit ipsum instinctu divino ad scribendum quæ oculis vidisset, aut a testibus fidelibus audivisset, vel denique lectione quorundam voluminum didicisset, assistente jugiter dum scribit Spiritu veritatis, ut nullatenus errare aut decipi possit."

[Father Simon endorses the preceding as embodying his own view of inspiration.]

7. From Frassen's *Disquisitiones Biblicæ*; 1682.

"Præsupponendum est Spiritum Sanctum tribus modis se habere ad certitudinem et veritatem alicujus Scripturæ, nempe, *antecedenter, concomitanter, et consequenter*. *Antecedenter* se habet dum inspirat, revelat, demonstrat quæ dicenda scribendave sunt; ita ut de suo proprio genio nihil addat scriptor, sed ea duntaxat scribat quæ a Spiritu Sancto inspirata revelataque sunt, ad eum modum quo discipulus magistro dictante excipit quæ ab eo proferuntur. *Concomitanter* ad Scriptorem sacrum se habet Spiritus Sanctus, cum non agit vices inspirantis et docentis, sed solum dirigentis, ut scriptorem in nullo errare fallique permittat; qualiter videtur habuisse in texendis iis libris sacris qui historias et ab aliis gesta referunt, quales sunt libri Judicum, Regum, Machabæorum, Evangeliorum, Acta Apostolorum, etc. *Consequenter* se habet Spiritus Sanctus ad aliquam scripturam, cum aliquid humano Spiritu et absque divina ulla speciali ope, directione et assistentia a quopiam homine fuit conscriptum; postea tamen, Spiritus Sancti instinctu verum et certum esse declaratur. Licet enim hujusmodi scriptura ex parte sui auctoris, nonnisi fidem humanam mereatur; quia tamen divino testimonio ejus veritas comprobatur, nullus est Christianus qui ut illi fidem adhibeat autoritate divina se non existimet adactum. Tunc enim certum est hæc verba eandem infallibilitatem habitura, quam habent cætera quæ inspiratione vel directione ejusdem Spiritus Sancti conscripta sunt."

8. From the Prolegomena of Bonfrerius, cap. viii. (1625). The extracts under this head are in substance, and partly in words, the same as those from Frassen, of which indeed they are a slight development, and therefore we do not quote them.

9. From the Jesuit Mariana (born 1536; died 1623), *Pro Editione Vulgata*.

"An credere debeamus Scriptores sacros non modo falli non potuisse in magnis, in minimis, sed et concedendum sit Spiritu Sancto dictante scripsisse omnia.

“Sunt enim viri docti et catholici qui utroque modo contigisse confirmant, pleraque inflatu Spiritus Divini excepsisse sine ulla cura aut labore; alia ex memoria de prompta scribentis, ex ratione, experimento, aut aliorum narratione, semper tamen Spiritus numine præsentis ne lapsus contingerent.”

[We omit an extract from the same author on the second book of Maccabees.]

10. From Cardinal Bellarmine (born 1542; died 1621), *De Verbo Dei*.

“Deum quidem esse autorem omnium divinarum scripturarum, sed aliter tamen adesse solitum prophetis, aliter aliis, præsertim historicis. Nam prophetis revelabat futura et simul assistebat ne aliquid falsi admiscerent in scribendo; et ideo prophetæ non alium habuerunt laborem quam scribendi vel dictandi: aliis autem scriptoribus Deus non semper revelabat ea quæ scripturi erant, sed excitabat ut scriberent ea quæ viderant vel audierant, quorum recordabantur; et simul assistebat ne falsi aliquid scriberent: quæ assistentia non faciebat ne laborarent in cogitando et quærendo quid et quomodo scripturi essent.”

11. Melchior Cano (born 1523; died 1560), bishop of the Canaries, *De Locis Theologicis*.

“Ipsi vero fatemur singula quæque, sive magna seu parva, a sacris autoribus Spiritu Sancto dictante esse edita: id a patribus accepimus, id fidelium animis inditum et quasi insculptum est. Id itaque et nos, Ecclesia præsertim magistra et duce, retinere debemus.

“Non enim asserimus per immediatam Spiritus Sancti revelationem, quæ quidem proprie revelatio dicenda sit, quamlibet Scripturæ partem fuisse editam.

“Sive ergo Matthæus et Joannes, sive Marcus et Lucas, quamvis illi visa, hi audita referrent, non egebant quidem nova Spiritus Sancti revelatione; egebant tamen peculiari Spiritus Sancti directione.

“Quæ sacri autores scripsere, hæc in duplici sunt differentia: quædam quæ supernaturali tantum revelatione cognoscebant, et ea Basilii tradit a Spiritu Sancto esse; alia vero naturali cognitione tenebant, quæ scilicet aut oculis viderant, aut manibus etiam attrectaverant; atque hæc quidem, ut paulo ante diximus, supernaturali lumine et expressa revelatione, ut scriberentur, non egebant; sed egebant tamen Spiritus Sancti præsentia et auxilio peculiari, ut, licet humana essent et naturæ ratione cognita, divinitus tamen sine ullo errore scriberentur. Hæc vero illa sunt quæ juxta Basilium Paulus et prophetæ de suo loquebantur.”

12. From Vincent Contenson, a Dominican (born 1640;

died 1674), author of *Theologia Mentis et Cordis*, which is probably the work quoted here, *Dissert. Præamb.*

"Nota ad veritatem sacrorum librorum non esse opus scriptores omnia ex immediata revelatione accepisse; nam a Petro Marcum, ab aliis apostolis beataque Virgine Lucam audivisse constat."

[All that is in Scripture has been written, he says]. "Speciali Dei instinctu, afflatu, assistentia, directione, et manutentionia.

"[The sacred writers] in omnibus igitur habuerunt, non revelationem, sed assistentiam et auxilium, ne laberentur."

13. From M. Arnauld (born 1612; died 1694), *Difficultés Prop. à M. Steyraert.*

"It would be no longer the pure word of God, if God had not generally dictated all that is found in it: for it would then be a mixture of the word of God and the word of men."

[Other extracts from the same writer follow, involving in like manner the idea of verbal inspiration, and claiming for every part of Scripture the character of a Divine revelation.]

14. From St. Basil, *Contra Eunomianos*, lib. v., cap. penult.

"For all things whatever the Spirit and the Son saith are the words of God, and therefore all Scripture is divinely inspired and is profitable, having been spoken by the Spirit; for this also shews truly that the Spirit is not a creature, because every rational creature speaks sometimes from itself, and sometimes what comes from God, as when Paul says, 'Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the Lord, yet I give my judgment as one that hath obtained mercy' (1 Cor. vii. 25). 'Now unto the married it is not I who command, but the Lord' (1 Cor. vii. 10). And the prophet, 'O Lord, yet will I speak with thee of thy judgments. Wherefore do the wicked prosper?' (Jer. xii. 1). And again, 'Woe is me, my mother, like whom hast thou borne me?' (Jer. xv. 10). And sometime (Moses) says, 'And thus saith the Lord, Send away my people, that they may serve me.' But not so the Spirit; for he does not at one time speak of himself, and at another what is from God. This pertains to the creature; but all the words of the Holy Spirit are those of God."

[We have not Basil's works at hand to verify this extract, which we translate from Simon's page. His version in one part runs to this effect: "Thus saith the Lord. And Moses says, I am slow of speech, and have a slow tongue. It is the same who speaks thus to Pharaoh, Let my people go," etc.]

15. From Jerome. We omit these, the intention of which is, like the preceding, to allow and to account for the human element and temporary allusions of Scripture.

16. From Fredigisus (an abbat of the ninth century), in controversy with Agobard of Lyons.

The former maintained, "Ut non solum sensum prædicationis et modos vel argumenta dictionum Spiritus Sanctus iis inspiraverit: sed etiam ipsa corporalia verba extrinsecus in ore ipsorum formaverit."

To which Agobard replied, "Restat ergo ut sicut ministerio angelico vox articulata formata est in ore asinæ, ita dicatis formari in ore prophetarum."

17. From an "approbation" given by certain doctors of the Sorbonne to a translation of the "Office of the Church" by the Port-royalists. Simon affirms that if the terms were rigidly adhered to, the translator might claim canonical authority.

"These prayers are very far from containing anything which is not conformed to the doctrine of the Church, since they have been dictated by the Holy Ghost which governs it. The same Spirit which inspired the saints with these divine prayers, has directed the pen of the faithful translator, that he should discover to us the burning brightness of that fire which he enkindles in their hearts, in order that it might be reflected upon those who read this work."

18. From another doctor, approving vol. i. of M. Arnauld on the *Perpetuity of the Faith*.

"It is to be hoped that the Spirit of God, which directed his pen when he composed this admirable work, will touch the heretics who shall read it."

[The preceding quotations from Simon are all to be found in part i., chap. iii. The subject is continued by him in chap. iv., where there are a considerable number of other extracts, mostly referring to the dispute between the Jesuits and the doctors of Louvain and Douay about inspiration. Although these passages might be useful and instructive, we must pass them over for the present, in order to find room for a few extracts from chap. v., where Simon states the opinions of the Calvinists, Lutherans, Socinians, and Arminians as to the inspiration of Holy Writ].

"There is no doubt that the Calvinists believe in the inspiration of the sacred authors by an immediate revelation of words and things: at least it is the most common opinion among their theologians. But some critics of their party, who have emancipated themselves, have advanced too freely that the apostles have sometimes been deceived by defect of memory, as can be seen in the remarks of Louis Capell on Acts v. 36, about Theudas. This critic says even in this place, that other authors before him have observed lapses in the sacred penmen: 'Atque hujusmodi lapsuum *μνημονικῶν* exempla nonnulla ab aliis observata

sunt in sacris scriptoribus.' But this opinion cannot be sustained if we consider that the Scripture, which is the rule of our faith, must necessarily be exempt from all error.

"Taylor and Bootius (qy. Booth?), Calvinistic Protestants, who have published a small work against the preface which Father Morin has placed at the head of his edition of the LXX., find themselves very much embarrassed to reconcile with the Hebrew the quotations of the Evangelists and the Apostles. They own indeed that they were inspired in all they wrote, and that the assistance of the Holy Spirit was absolutely needful for them to acquit themselves of their duty; but they add at the same time, that when they quote in their writings certain texts of the Old Testament, they do not need to quote them word for word, because the kingdom of God does not consist in words. Whence they conclude that the Holy Spirit did not judge it fitting that these holy ministers of his word, in citing the Old Testament, should adhere to the words; that he has been satisfied for them only to record the sense. Take the very words of these two learned critics, who profess to follow herein the sentiment of Thomas Gataker, an able English Protestant: 'Quæ assistentia (Spiritus Sancti) iis summopere erat ad implendam provinciam iis a Christo injunctum necessaria. Ast uti dicta prophetarum, quoties ea in suis sermonibus vel scriptis allegabant, αὐτολέξει et totidem referrent, id vero nequaquam erat necessarium, quando quidem regnum Dei non in verbis consistit, sed in virtute. Itaque Spiritui Sancto visum non fuit sacros illos suæ gratiæ ministros, quoties aliquid ex antiquis oraculis citarent, ipsis vocabulorum atque syllabarum cancellis includere; sed satis habuit in sententiarum veritate eos continere. . . . Non magnopere curat singulas res quæ in transitu observari poterant scrupulose commonstrare, omniaque minutatim quæ de iis dici poterant enarrare; neque tamen ob istius rei omissionem dici potest parum diligenter pleneve officio suo functus esse. Sic fere (ut magnis parva componantur) habuit se regimen illud quo sacros Evangelii præcones in recto tramite atque via veritatis direxit Spiritus Sanctus.' "

20. From Faustus Socinus (born 1525; died 1604), *Lectiones Sacræ*.

"Monumenta habemus scripta quæ nobis Deus mirabili et benignissimo consilio dedit et conservavit, divinorum virorum qui vel ab ipso divino Spiritu impuls, eoque dictante, vel Spiritu Sancto pleni, illa litteris commiserunt: hi sunt libri quos Biblia seu Vetus et Novum Testamentum vulgo appellamus."

21. From Sir Norton Knatchbull, *Animad. in Nov. Testament.*



"Dictavit Spiritus sensum, non verba singula, vel verborum formam; uno enim tunc ore loquerentur singuli."

22. From Simon Episcopus, *Notæ breves in Matth.*

"Posito etiam, vel dato, sed non concesso, quod error aliquis ab iis commissus esset in recensione hac, aut quod sphalma ullum aliunde in historiam hanc irrepserit, parum profecto hoc movere posset aut deberet hominem vere probum et divinæ legis amantem."

The foregoing extracts really represent a considerable number of writers of different ages and of various theological opinions. They shew that these writers all agree in upholding the reality of divine inspiration; and nearly all in clearly distinguishing the inspiration of the sacred penmen from that of others. They differ, however, in regard to the degree and measure of the divine afflatus. A few advocate a scheme closely allied to, if not identical with, that of which Haldane and Gaussen have been the distinguished propounders and expositors. By far the larger number set forth views generally according with that modified system which has had eminent defenders in our own day, which claims to be truly a theory of plenary inspiration, and which vindicates for the whole canon of Scripture the right to be called the Word of God. Yet this is not verbal inspiration, and we doubt whether one in ten among the older writers upon the subject insisted upon the verbal inspiration of every part of the Bible. Probably the lowest ground was usually occupied by Roman Catholics, who have to construct a theory which can be reconciled with the admissions of certain apocryphal writers, as already mentioned. They are also compelled to make their theory square with other facts in the apocryphal books, and in the history of the canon. The general feeling of the Protestant writers seems to have been that there were degrees of inspiration: that in one case the Spirit prompted a man to write what he knew, and directed him in the general selection of materials, so that he only took the best, and so much as was necessary: and that in other cases the very words of the message or statement to be written were supplied by divine teaching; but that in almost all circumstances the inspired retained their individual peculiarities, of thought, feeling, style, etc. The reader will draw his own conclusions from the facts now before him.

(To be continued.)



**TYNDALE'S TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, ETC.,  
AND MR. FRY'S FACSIMILES.\***

SEMPER EADEM is the avowed and distinguishing feature of the Roman Church. But we do not think it is true of that Church in its natural and obvious significance. The one word which characterizes it in every decade of the last thousand years is, *expediency*: thus far it has been "always the same." Our present business, however, is not controversy, although it is impossible to introduce our subject without a few words which may savour of it. While therefore our preliminary remarks will be, strictly speaking, historical, we shall not fail to draw one or two inferences.

The principle of giving God's people the Holy Scriptures in the vernacular tongues is illustrated in the originals of those Scriptures. The greater portion of the Old Testament was written in Hebrew, the vernacular language of Israel; but when their national speech was well-nigh lost, or rather exchanged for the Chaldee, that was the language in which some of the inspired penmen wrote more or less. When the Hebrew became still more a dead letter, the Jewish Church was provided with free translations of the whole Bible into Chaldee. For the sake of those who had adopted Greek it was translated into Greek. The New Testament writers gave the world the writings of the New Covenant in Greek, the vernacular of the greater part of the then civilized world, and almost everywhere known. The Church adopted the plan of the synagogue, and gave to sundry nations the Scriptures in their mother tongue. Hence we find translations into Syriac, Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, Armenian, Gothic, and so forth. These were followed by others, and hence we find versions of Scripture in Anglo-Saxon and other tongues. As time rolled on, the Latin Church in particular departed so far from primitive simplicity that it began to be felt inexpedient to encourage the possession of the Bible among the

---

\* *The First New Testament printed in the English Language* (1525 or 1526). Translated from the Greek by William Tyndale. Reproduced in Facsimile, with an Introduction by Francis Fry, F.S.A. Bristol: printed for the Author. MDCCLXII.

*The Prophete Jonas. With an Introduction before teachinge to understonde him, and the right use also of all the Scripture, etc., etc.* By William Tyndale. Reproduced in Facsimile. To which is added Coverdale's Version of Jonah, with an Introduction by Francis Fry, F.S.A. London: Willis and Sotheran. Bristol: Lasbury. 1863.

*A Proper Dyalogue betwene a Gentillman and a Husbandman eche complayninge to other their miserable calamitie through the Ambicion of Clergye, with a compendious olde Treatyse shewinge howe that we ought to have the Scripture in Englysshe.* Hans Luft, 1530. Reproduced in Facsimile, with an Introduction by Francis Fry, F.S.A. London: Willis and Sotheran. Bristol: Lasbury. 1863.

mass of the people. Hence vernacular versions began to be discouraged; and at length, in a council held at Toulouse in 1229, the Scriptures in general, and vulgar versions in particular, were prohibited to the laity in the following terms:—

*“Prohibemus etiam, ne libros Veteris et Novi Testamenti laici permittantur habere; nisi forte Psalterium, aut Breviarium pro divinis officiis, ac Horas beatæ Virginis aliquis ex devotione habere velit: sed ne præmissos libros habeant in vulgari translatos.”*<sup>b</sup>

In plain English,—“We also forbid that the laity should be permitted to have the books of the Old and New Testament; except perchance any one should wish, out of devotion, to have the Psalter or the Breviary for divine services, and the Hours of the blessed Virgin: but let them not have the aforesaid books translated into the vulgar tongue.”

This monstrous decree became the basis of subsequent practice, and placed the laity beyond the reach of the only means by which they could ascertain the purity or impurity of the doctrines and practices enforced upon them. Nevertheless, there were rebels against it, and we all know what took place in our own country in the case of Wycliffe. He translated the Bible into English; and although he died in peace, his dead bones were dug up and burned years after by a decree of the council of Constance. Popular feeling and faith was too strong for councils and popes and prelates; and although many Bibles were burned, and many of those who read them too, the circulation and reading of the vernacular versions went on.

The discovery of printing had an enormous influence in favour of this popular feeling, by multiplying the facilities for producing copies of the Scriptures.

In due time William Tyndale appeared, and his history may be summed up in a very few words: he translated the Scriptures into English, and that which called itself the Church strangled him to death, and then burnt his dead body.

No matter. The servant dies, but the Master lives; and his work must be done, even though enemies do it.

The translation of the Scriptures was carried on with new energy in various lands; and in our own, at length, Englishmen conquered for themselves the possession of their proudest birth-right—the right to read the Scriptures in their mother tongue.

Rome had thundered in vain. What did she do? In 1582 she printed, or allowed to be printed, at Rheims, an English New Testament, “translated out of Latin, with notes and neces-

<sup>b</sup> M. L. Bail, *Summa Concil.*, 2, 576: *Hefele Conciliengesch.*, 5, 875.

sary helps." In 1609 the Old Testament also made its appearance at Douay. At the present time this translation, somewhat revised, is circulated by myriads every year among the Roman Catholics who speak English. Tyndale's work is so far justified by those who martyred him for doing it.

The time had gone by for the Roman city to command the world; and even when the Council of Trent legislated upon the reading of the Scriptures, it was compelled to concede and recede. Thenceforth the Bible was in theory allowed to the laity under certain restrictions. Policy dictated, and has never ceased to dictate, that the use of Scripture should be as limited as possible, and it is an unquestioned fact that, in Catholic countries to this day, not more than one in a hundred possesses a Bible. But still the hundredth has it, and the proportion is increasing. Rome itself has been among the most pertinacious in resisting. Of the Greek New Testament even, not a single edition was ever issued from the Roman press until that of Cardinal Mai five or six years ago. To this day, Protestant versions without exception are absolutely prohibited, and the prohibition extends to some of the Catholic translations. The zealous, pious, and learned Van Ess laboured, might and main, even in our own day, to promote the circulation of the Scriptures, and the treatment he received will be an eternal disgrace to his communion.

Bearing in mind these facts, and remembering that they are only a few among thousands, we cannot but look with intense interest upon the labours of Mr. Fry, who has reproduced in facsimile the translation of William Tyndale, so far as the New Testament and the Book of Jonah are concerned. When men like Cardinal Wiseman, in his late volume of sermons, are telling us how we have the use of the Scriptures, it is well to recall some of the facts connected with the literary policy of Rome. It is well too that we should recollect the struggles and bitter deaths of some who first sought to place the Scriptures in the hands of the people.

It is not our purpose, however, now to write the life of Tyndale; our business is chiefly with Mr. Fry and his labours of love, which will claim the remainder of the space at our disposal. No mere verbal description can fairly represent the beauty and accuracy of the interesting and valuable facsimiles of which we have given the titles. Our endeavour will therefore be simply to record what these facsimiles comprise, to give a few extracts, and to add certain details chiefly borrowed from Mr. Fry's introductions.

The introduction to the New Testament contains an account

of Tyndale and his work. He was born in Gloucestershire about 1484, and studied, first at Oxford, and afterwards at Cambridge. In 1519 he became tutor in the family of Sir John Walsh of Little Sodbury, and here he remained for two or three years, during which time he became conspicuous for his zeal in behalf of the principles of the Reformation. In 1522 he was accused and menaced, but for the present escaped. He next went to London, thinking to enter the service of Tonstall, but the project failed, and he continued for a while with a wealthy citizen named Munmouth, in the latter part of 1523. He secretly cherished the desire to translate the New Testament into English, but no opportunity presented itself here, so he resolved to see what he could do in Germany. He therefore went to Hamburg in 1524, and in 1525 we find him printing at Cologne an English New Testament in quarto, with short notes. This work was interrupted by the Romanists; Tyndale, however, once more escaped, and went on to Worms. A fragment of his unfinished book is in the British Museum. The first complete New Testament in English which he succeeded in producing seems to have been printed in octavo at Worms, but without notes, prologue, date, or name of place and printer.

Mr. Fry has endeavoured to ascertain when, where, and by whom this important volume was printed; and he regards it as almost certain that it was printed by Peter Schoeffer, at Worms, in 1525 or 1526. An examination of the royal libraries of Stuttgart and Munich enabled Mr. Fry to compare some of Schoeffer's known productions with Tyndale's *New Testament*, and he found among them books manifestly printed from the same fount of type, and upon similar paper with the same water-marks. The volumes also agree in various technical details, as in the number of lines to a page, the length of the lines, etc.

The only perfect copy known of this precious edition of the New Testament is that in the Library of the Baptist College at Bristol, where it has been since 1784. From this volume the late George Offor<sup>c</sup> edited a reprint with portrait and memoir, in 1836. From the same, Mr. Fry has executed his remarkable lithographed facsimile edition. We insert here his account of the original work :—

“The description of the Bristol Tyndale may be given as follows :—It is not in the original binding, has ‘Joseph Ames’ stamped outside on both the covers, and Ames’s book-plate is pasted in it. It is lettered on the back, ‘*Novæ Testamenti by Tyndall* 1st EDITION. m.d.xxvi.’ ‘OXFORD’ was also on the back, but has been partly gilt over, and ‘FORD’ only is

---

<sup>c</sup> He died August 4th, 1864.

now legible. There are marginal references in manuscript, apparently contemporaneous, throughout the volume, which have been cut into by the binder, shewing that the size has been considerably reduced. A leaf measures  $5\frac{1}{2}$  by 4 inches. The volume is evidently a choice copy, and it probably belonged, at an early period, to some person of distinction; as the capitals, woodcuts, and paragraph marks inserted on every page, being 2606 in number, are all illuminated. The pages are ruled with red lines, and there are passages marked with brackets in red ink. A page, finished in all respects like the original, will be found at page 26. The imperfect copy in St. Paul's Library has none of these ornaments.

"The volume is without title, and begins with the text on folio 1, signature *Æ* ii, and extends in *eights* to folio 343, misprinted 353, with three unnumbered leaves, as will be seen in the following work. BB 8 is a blank leaf not numbered. Probably the title was on *Æ* i. We know that if there was a title it had not the translator's name on it; for Tyndale himself elsewhere says, 'The cause why I set my name before this litle treatise & have not rather don it in the new testament is, that when I folowed the councel of Chryste which exhorteth men Math. vi. to do their good deades secretly and to be contente with the conscience of wel doynge, and that God seeth us, and pacyentlye to abyde the rewarde of the last day which christ hath purchased for us: and nowe wold faine have done lykewise, but am compelled otherwise to do.'"

This passage is followed by another in which Mr. Fry records his own labours, and it is on several accounts so instructive that we transfer it for the information of our readers:—

"I have thought a reproduction of the only known copy of the first edition of Tyndale's New Testament, perhaps the most interesting book in our language, well worth the time, money, and pains employed in its execution. It is a faithful representation of the original; and will be valued not only as a Version, but as shewing the state of the English language, the style of the printing, the orthography (which is very irregular), the punctuation, the divisions of the words at the end of the lines (even to a letter), and the contractions used. It has been made by tracing on transfer paper, placing this on lithographic stones, and then printing it in the usual way; a method evidently calculated to insure the closest possible correspondence with the original.

"To prove the correctness of the work, I have compared a proof of every page, folding it so as to place each line parallel with, and close to, the same line in the original; so that, by comparing the line all along, I could easily see that it was correct. *In this way I have examined every line throughout the volume*, and I believe that not a single incorrect letter will be found in it. I have devoted so much time to this careful examination, in order that the accuracy of the work may be relied on. Tyndale alludes, in his address 'To the Reder,' to 'the rudness of the worke.' This may refer to errors in the printing; and these the reader will see, as no alterations have been made. At the end of the volume we have 'the Errours comitted in the prentyng.' Some of these errors, however, do not exist, and others are incorrectly quoted. I state this, lest it should

be supposed that I have anywhere corrected or altered the text. I have specially examined all the lines referred to in the list, and can say that they are correctly copied. Tyndale says, 'There is not so moch as one *I* therin/ if it lacke a tytle over his hed but they have noted it/ and nombre it unto the ignorant people for an heresy.' There are but few tittles omitted.

"The paper on which this Testament is printed has been expressly manufactured to imitate the colour and appearance of the original. It is *hand-made*, the fine and cross wires being placed in the paper maker's mould so as to produce the same wire-marks as appear in the paper used by Schoeffer. The large paper copies are printed on the same paper, made thicker for the purpose. A few copies have been printed on *old* paper, which will be designated as such.

"As it was by no means uncommon for the early printers to work off some copies of their works on vellum, and as we have many examples of the Holy Scriptures having been so printed, a few copies have been taken off on this material.

"The whole impression of the present work consists of 177 copies, of which 26 are in quarto. To produce these, the entire text has been transferred from the 88 stones used in printing the octavo size, to 176 stones required for the quarto size, so as to obtain the wider inside and top margins. More than 50 copies are specially reserved and appropriated. It is proper to state that the work has been effaced from the stones."

In addition to the facsimiles thus patiently and diligently executed, Mr. Fry has produced facsimiles of six pages of titles and letter press from books printed by Peter Schoeffer, with specimens of the watermarks. With regard to these watermarks we may notice, that both the larger and the smaller are to be found in a volume now before us, and printed by the same Peter Quentell, whom Tyndale first employed to print his New Testament. The volume to which we refer is a collection of acts of councils, printed at Cologne in 1530. The smaller watermark appears in the Greek Testament of Cephalaëus (Strasbourg: 1524). Where or by whom the paper thus extensively employed was made we know not, but it is perhaps worth notice that both the designs may be called variations of the *fool's-cap*, and that the smaller one is the symbol of the Swiss canton of Basel.

The preceding extract will shew that Mr. Fry's edition is in three forms; one in octavo, and two in quarto, or on large paper: of the large paper some are on modern and some on really *old* paper, some are without illuminations, and a few have been illuminated throughout. All of them, and especially the latter, are very beautiful specimens of art.

Let us now shortly describe one of the copies as it lies before us. The volume is a small thick quarto, done up in cloth of a

very quiet colour. It contains 353 leaves of text, three pages to the reader, and three of errata, all which are lithographed in facsimile. Mr. Fry's introduction and illustrative facsimiles precede. The paper of the book is really old, whereas the other copies are on paper in imitation of the old. On glancing over the contents we notice a peculiarity in the order of books, which runs thus:—Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, 1 and 2 Peter, 1, 2, and 3 John, Hebrews, James, Jude, Revelation. The position of Hebrews distinctly indicates the difficulty which was felt as to its Pauline authorship, and the position of James may have something to do with the opinion as to its doubtful canonicity.

A certain number of the books are illustrated with small and minutely-executed vignettes, coloured and gilt. These appear at the head of each of the following books: four Gospels, Acts, Romans, 1 Peter, 1 John, Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelation. Most of them are meant for portraits, with conventional symbols. Matthew, the *man* is writing a book; Mark also writing, with a sort of winged lion before him; Luke, with an ox, sits at an easel painting a portrait of the Virgin and child; an eagle attends upon John, who is writing, and gazing on visions of glory. In Acts the descent of the Spirit is represented; Paul with a sword appears in Romans; he is followed by Peter with a key; by John with a chalice; by Paul again, prefixed to Hebrews, as before; then by James and Jude, and by that to the Revelation, which last includes certain symbols. The rest of the books are introduced by illuminated initials, and the chapters also, but in a smaller form. A well-known sign, resembling an Old English *¶*, stands at the top of each page, is prefixed to all the chapters, and to most of the paragraphs. In St. Luke's Gospel, the first four verses stand as an actual prologue, and are followed by the words,—

“THE FYRST CHAPTER

“In the tyme of Herode kynge of iewry,” etc.

Although specimens of this version have been frequently given, our notice would scarcely be complete without one or two. The first we shall select from the gospel of St. Matthew, chap. ii., 1—12. To this extract we shall add for the sake of comparison three others.<sup>d</sup>

---

<sup>d</sup> These three are given as printed by Dr. Symonds in his *Observations upon the Expediency of revising the present English Version*. Cambridge, 1789. Part ii., pp. 158, 159.



"When Jesus was borne in Bethleem a toune of Jury, in the tyme of kynge Herode: Beholde, there came wyse men from the est to Jerusalem saynge: Where is he that is borne kynge of the Jues? We have sene his starre in the est, and are come to worship hym.

"Herode the kynge after he hadd herde thys, was troubled, and all Jeusalem with hym, and he sent for all the chefe prestes and scribes off the people, and demaunded off them where Christe shulde be borne. They sayde vnto hym: in Bethleem a toune of Jury. For thus it is written be the prophet: And thou Bethleem in the londe of Jury, shalt not be the leest as perteyninge to the princes of iuda. For out of the shal come a captaine, whyche shall govern my people israhel.

"Then Herod prevely called the wyse men, and dyligently enquiryed of them, the tyme of the starre that appered. And sent them to Bethleem, saynge: When ye be come thyder searche dyligently for the childe. And when ye have founde hym bringe me worde, that y maye come and worshippe hym also. When they had herde the kynge, they departed, and lo the starre whych they sawe in the este went before them, vntyll it came and stod over the place where the chylde was. When they sawe the starre they were marveylously gladd, and entred into the house, and founde the childe with Mary hys mother, and kneled doune and worshipped hym, and opened there treaseures, and offred vnto hym gyftes, gold, frackynsence, and myr. And after they were warned in ther slepe, that they shulde not go ageyne to Herod they retourned into ther awen countre another way."

## ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. II.

*Cranmer's, or the Great Bible, printed at London, by E. Whitchurch, 1541.*

Whē Jesus was borne at Bethleē a cytie of Jewry, in the tyme of Herode the kynge: Beholde, there came wyse men frō the east to Jerusalem, sayng: Where is he that is borne kynge of Jewes? For we have sene hys starre in the east, & are come to worshippe hym.

When Herode the kynge had herde these thynges, he was troubled, and all ye cytie of Jerusalem with hym. And whan he had gathered all the chefe prestes and scribes of the people together, he demaunded of them, where Christ shoulde be borne.

*Geneva Bible, the first Edition, printed at Geneva, by Rowland Hall, 1560.*

1. When Jesus then was borne at Bethlehem in Judea, in the dayes of Herode the king, beholde, there came wise-men from the East to Jerusalem,

2. Saying, where is the king of the Jewes that is borne? for we have sene his starre in the East, & are come to worship him.

3. When king Herode heard *this*, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.

4. And gathering together all the chief Priests and Scribes of the people, he asked of them, where Christ shulde be borne.

*Parker's, or the Bishops' Bible, the first Edition, printed at London, by Richard Jugge, 1568.*

1. When Jesus was borne in Bethlehem, a citie of Jurie, in the dayes of Herode the kyng, beholde, there came wise men from the East to Hierusalem,

2. Saying, Where is he that is borne kyng of Jewes? for we have seene his starre in the East, and are come to worship hym.

3. When Herode the kyng had hearde these thynges, he was troubled, and all [the citie of] Hierusalem with hym.

4. And when hee hadde gathered all the chiefe Priestes and Scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ shoulde be borne.

And they said unto hym:  
At Bethleem in Jewrye.  
For thus it is wrytten  
by the Prophete: And  
thou Bethleem in the  
lande of Juda, art not the  
leest amonge the princes  
of Juda. For out of the  
shal there come unto me  
the captayne, that shall  
governe my people Is-  
rael.

Then Herode (whē he  
had prevely called the  
wyse men) he enquiryed  
of thē diligently what  
time the starre appered,  
& he had them go to  
Bethleem, & said: Go  
yours way thither, &  
search diligētly for ye  
chylde. And whē ye have  
foude him, bringe me  
worde againe that I may  
come and worshyp hym  
also.

When they had herd  
ye kyng, they departed:  
and lo, the starre whych  
they saw in the east,  
went before thē, tyl it  
came, & stode over the  
place, wherin the chylde  
was. Whē they sawe the  
starre, they were ex-  
ceedyng glad: and went  
into the house, and foude  
the chylde wyth Mary his  
mother, & fel down flat  
and worshipped hym,  
and opened their trea-  
sures & offered unto hym  
gyftes, golde, frankin-  
sense, & myrrhe. And  
after they were warned  
of God in slepe (that they  
shuld not go agayne to  
Herode) they returned  
into theyr owne countre  
another waye.

5. And they said unto  
him, at Bethlehem in  
Judea; for so it is writ-  
ten by the Prophet,

6. And thou Beth-  
lehem in the land of  
Juda, are not the least  
among the princes of  
Juda; for out of thee  
shall come the governour  
that shal fede my people  
Israel.

7. Then Herode prively  
called the Wise-men, and  
diligently inquired of  
them the time of the  
starre that appeared,

8. And sent them to  
Beth-lehem, saying, Go,  
and searche diligently for  
the babe; and when ye  
have founde him, bring  
me worde againe, that I  
may come also, and wor-  
ship him.

9. So when they had  
heard the king, they de-  
parted: and lo, the starre  
which they had sene in  
the East, went before  
them, til it came, and  
stode over the place where  
the babe was.

10. And when they  
sawe the starre, they re-  
joyced with an exceed-  
ing great joye,

11. And went into the  
house, and founde the  
babe with Marie his mo-  
ther, and fel downe, and  
worshipped him, and  
opened their treasures,  
and presented unto him  
giftes, *even* golde, and in-  
cense, and myrrhe.

12. And after they  
were warned of God in a  
dreame, that they shulde  
not go againe to Herode,  
they returned into their  
country another way.

5. And they saide unto  
him, At Bethlehem in  
Jurie, for thus it is writ-  
ten by the Prophete,

6. And thou Bethle-  
hem[in] the lande of Juda,  
art not the least among  
the princes of Juda. For  
out of thee shall there  
come a capitaine, that  
shal governe my people  
Israel.

7. Then Herode, when  
he had privily called the  
wyse men, inquired of  
them diligently, what  
time the starre appeared.

8. And he sent them  
to Bethlehem, and sayde:  
Go and search diligently  
for the young childe, and  
when ye have founde  
hym, bryng me worde  
again, that I may come  
and worship hym also.

9. When they had  
hearde the kyng, they  
departed, and loe, the  
starre which they sawe  
in the East, went before  
them, tyl it came and  
stode over (the place)  
wherein the young  
chylde was.

10. And when they  
sawe the starre, they re-  
joyced exceedingly with  
great joy.

11. And went into the  
house, and founde the  
younge chylde with  
Marie his mother, & fell  
downe, and worshipped  
hym, and opened their  
treasures, and presented  
unto hym gyftes, golde,  
and frankensence and  
mirre.

12. And after they  
were warned of God in  
a dreame, that they  
shoulde not go againe to  
Herode, they returned  
unto their owne country  
another way.

As we said, we insert the preceding versions for the sake of  
comparison. We shall now add one more from Tyndale's transla-  
tion, choosing for this purpose the first chapter of St. John's gospel.

## "THE GOSPELL OFF SANCTE JHON.

## "THE FYRST CHAPTER.

"In the begynnynge was that worde, and that worde was with god: and god was thatt worde. The same was in the begynnynge wyth god. All thynges were made by it, and with out it, was made noo thinge, that made was. In it was lyfe, And lyfe was the light of men, and the light shyneth in darcknes, and darcknes comprehended it not.

"There was a man sent from god, whose name was Jhon. The same cam as a witnes, to beare witnes of the light, that all men through him myght beleve He was nott that light: but to beare witnes of the light. That was a true light, which lighteneth all men that come into the worlde. He was in the worlde, and the worlde by him was made: and the worlde knewe hym not.

"He cam into his awne, and his receaved him not. Vnto as meny as receaved him, gave he power to be the sonnes of god: in that they beleved on his name: which were borne not of bloude nor of the will of the fleshe, nor yet of the will of men: but of god.

"And that worde was made flesshe, and dwelt amonge vs, and we sawe the glory off yt, as the glory off the only begotten sonne off the father, [fol. cxix, b] which worde was full of grace, and verite.

"Jhon bear witnes off hym sayinge: Thys is he of whome I spake, he that commeth after me, was before me because he was yer than I. And of his fulnes have all we receaved, even favour for favour, For the lawe was geven by Moses, but favour and verite cam by Jesus Christ. No man sawe god at any tyme. The only begotten sonne, which is in the father's bosom, hath declared hym.

"And this is the recorde off Jhon, When the iewes sent prestes, and levites from Jerusalem, to axe hym, What art thou? And he confessed, and denyed nott, and sayde playnly: I am nott Christ. And they axed hym: what then? arte thou Helias? and he sayde: I am nott. Arte thou a prophet? And he answered noo. Then sayde they vnto hym: what arte thou? That we maye geve an answer to them that sent vs? what sayest thou of thy selfe? He sayde: I am the voyce of a cryar in the wildernes, make strayght the waye of the lorde, as sayde the prophet Esayas.

"And they which were sent, were off the pharises. And they axed hym: and sayde vnto him: why baptisest thou then, if thou be nott Christ, nor Helias, nether a prophet? Jhon answered them sayinge: I baptise with water: butt one is come amonge you, whom ye knowe nott: he it is that cometh after me, which was before me, whose shone latched, I am not worthy to vnlose. These thynges were done in Bethabara beyonde Jordan, where Jhon did baptise.

"The nexte daye Jhon sawe Jesus commynge [fol. cxx, a] vnto hym, and sayde: beholde the lambe of god: whych taketh awaye the synne off the worlde. This is he of whom I sayde: After me commeth a man, which was before me. For he was yer then I, and I knew hym nott: butt that he shuld be declared to Israhell, therefore cam I baptisyng with water.

"And Jhon bare recorde, sayinge: I sawe the sprete descende from heven, lyke vnto a dove, and it aboode apon hym, and I knewe hym not: but he that sent me to baptyse in water, sayde vnto me: Apon whom thou shalt se the sprete descende, and tary styll on hym, the same is he whych baptyseth with the holy goost. And I sawe yt, and have borne recorde, that thys ys the sonne off God.

"The next daye after Jhon stode agayne, and two off hys disciples, and he behelde Jesus as he walked by, and sayde: beholde the lambe off God. And the two disciples herde hym speake, and they folowed Jesus. Jesus turned about, and sawe them folowe, And sayde vnto them: what seke ye? They sayde vnto hym: Rabi (which is to say be interpretacion, Master) where dwellest thou? He sayde vnto them: come and se. They cam and sawe where he dwelt: and abode with hym that daye. For it was about the tenthe houre.

"Won off the two whych herde Jhon speake, and folowed Jesus, was Andrew Simon Peters brother. The same found hys brother Symon fyrst, and sayde vnto hym: we have founde Messias, whych ys be interpretacion anno<sup>(\*)</sup>unted: and brought hym to Jesus. And Jesus behelde hym and sayde: Thou art Simon the sonne off Jonas, Thou shalt be called Cephas: which is by interpretacion a stone.

"The daye folowyng Jesus wolde to goo into galile, and founde Philip, and sayde vnto hym: folowe me. Philip was of Betsaida the cite of Andrew and Peter. Philip founde Nathanael, and sayde unto hym: We have founde hym off whom Moses wrote in the lawe, and the prophetes: Jesus the son of Joseph of Nazareth. And Nathanaell sayde vnto hym: Can there eny goode thyng come out off Nazareth? Philip sayde to hym: Come and se.

"Jesus sawe Nathanael commynge to hym, and sayde of hym: Behold a right hisrahelite, in whom is no gyle. Nathanael sayd vnto hym: From whence knewest thou me? Jesus answered and sayde vnto hym: Before that Philip called the, when thou wast vnder the fygge tree, I sawe the. Nathanael answered and sayde vnto hym: Rabi, thou arte the sonne off God, Thou arte the kynge of Israhel. Jesus answered and sayd vnto hym: Because I sayde vnto the, I sawe the vnder the fygge tree, thou belevest. Thou shalt se greater thynges then these. And he sayde vnto hym: Verely, verely, I saye vnto you: here after shall ye se heven open, and the angells off God ascendyng, and descendyng over the sonne off man."

At the close of this venerable translation of the New Testament, there is an earnest and instructive epilogue addressed to the reader. As our object is not to attempt a critical estimate of Tyndale's great work, but a description of what Mr. Fry has done, we must now proceed to the second publication on our list.

"The Prophete Jonas" is another choice production, and

\* [Fol. cxx, b, begins with the letters *unted*]. *Anno* is of course *anointed*.

one which the disciples of Sir Richard de Bury will wish not to be without. But, like the New Testament, it has claims of a far higher character to our regard than those which may give it value in the eyes of the bibliophile: it is one of the books for the printing of which William Tyndale was strangled and burned at the stake by the Papists in 1536, at Vilvorde, near Brussels. Can it be wondered if, when we contemplate the noble qualities and works of this holy martyr for Christ and his Church, we feel indignant that so-called Christianity ever devised and executed such laws as that *de hæretico comburendo*? It has been said that the Church never did put any one to death for heresy, and never will. But this is a miserable subterfuge. Aonio Paleario is not the only one who has been martyred for his faith at Rome itself. The history of the Inquisition is not an absolute myth; and we suppose the *auto da fes* of Spain were real events. For centuries, popes, cardinals, and dignitaries of all grades regarded burning as the proper punishment of heretics. It is a maxim that heresy is a purely ecclesiastical crime, and when persisted in, to be punished with death. "Et licet parum referre videatur, dummodo pœna mortis plectuntur, an gladio, igni, vel alio supplicio interficiantur, ut per Alphons. Castr. de just. hæret. punit., lib. ii., c. xii., regulariter tamen hæretici in eorum mala opinione pertinaces, vivi in conspectu hominum comburendi."<sup>f</sup> There is no question that this was the law of the Church, and at the same time the civil law of Europe. It is well known, too, that it was the law and practice in England. The Church assuredly condemned heretics to be burned, and required the civil power to carry out the sentence. Even our own Sir Thomas More not only admitted the justice of all this; he looked upon it as a necessity. He may not have wished to burn heretics, but it was only because he wished there were none to burn. In one of his furious writings against Tyndale he speaks out somewhat plainly, thus: "But there should have been more burned by a great many than there have been within this seven year last passed: the lack whereof, I fear me, will make more burned within this seven year next coming, than else should have needed to have been burned in seven score." If the Reformation and the march of modern ideas has done nothing else, it has given the quietus to this barbarous legislation. Sir Thomas More sincerely believed that all heretics should be charitably roasted, and the sooner the better. In this he did

---

<sup>f</sup> *Præcis Archiepiscopalis sive Thes. Fori Eccles.* Auctore Joanne Franc. Leone. Seravalli Veneti, 1607. Cum privilegiis, superiorum permissu; where there is more of the same kind, and numerous references to authorities. Our extract is from p. 614.

but echo the sentiments of the then last general council held at Constance; he only said what that assembly claimed to have determined by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

Let us, however, leave this melancholy topic, with the simple remark, that all we ask for is that Rome should renounce these horrible decrees, and, in imitation of the Protestants, cancel for ever all such sanguinary laws.

We must omit a great deal of interesting matter, but we may observe that Tyndale proceeded with the Old Testament after finishing the New. Part only of this work was completed before his martyrdom. Among the portions he executed, the Book of Jonah is mentioned by Sir T. More, who suggests not only that it was published, but that it was very dangerous. Hear this refined writer:—"Then have we Jonas made out by Tyndale, a book that whoso delight therein shall stand in peril, that Jonas was never so swallowed up with the whale, as by the delight of that book a man's soul may be so swallowed up by the devil, that he shall never have the 'grace to get out again.'" The fact is, that Sir Thomas cherished about as much love for Tyndale as Saul did for David. We cannot wonder that when More's head was cut off, his enemies feared that his extreme purity would preserve that head from corruption, and so to prevent the miracle, they bathed it in boiling water before they publicly exhibited it: *priusquam exponeretur aqua ferventi decoctum est.*<sup>s</sup>

This Book of Jonah was utterly lost, with the exception of the prologue; but Lord A. Hervey recently found a copy of it, and from that Mr. Fry's beautiful facsimile has been made. It was probably printed at Antwerp by Martin Lempereur in 1530 or 1531. In preparing his edition Mr. Fry has pursued the same course as in regard to the New Testament, and with a like happy result. As our readers may be curious to know what sort of things were supposed by the author of *Utopia* to enable the devil effectually and beyond recovery to swallow a man's soul, we present them with a quotation from the preface, to which we prefix the title:—

### "The prophete

Jonas, with an introducciō before teachinge to vnderstōde him and the right vse also of all the scripture, and why it was written, and what is therein to be sought, and shewenge wherewith the scripture is locked vpp that he which readeth it, can not vnderstōde it, though he studie therein neuer so moch: and agayne with what keyes it is so opened, that the

---

<sup>s</sup> *Epist. de Morte Thomæ Mori.* G. C. Nucerinus. Ed. 1563.

reader can be stopped out with no sotilte or false doctrine of man, from the true sense and vnderstandynge therof.

“W. T. Vn to the Christen reader.

“As ye ēvious Philistenes stopped ye welles of Abraham ād filled them vpp with erth, ts put ye memoriall out of mīde, to ye eutent yt they might chalenge ye grounde: even so the fleshly mīded ypocrites stoppe vpp the vaynes of life which are in ye scripture, wt the erth of theyr tradiciōs, false similitudes and lienge allegories: & yt of like zele, to make ye scripture theyr awne possessiō and marchaundice: and so shutt vpp the kingdome of heven which is Gods worde nether enterige in thē selues nor soferinge them that wolde.

“The scripture hath a body with out, ād within a soule, sprite and life. It hath wt out a barke, a shell ād as it were an hard bone for ye fleshly mynded to gnaw vppon. And within it hath pith, cornell, mary, & all swetnesse for Gods electe which he hath chosen to geve them his spirite, & to write his law & ye faith of his sonne in their hertes.

“The scripture cōteyneth iii. thiges in it first ye law to cōdemne all flesh: secōdarily ye Gospell, yt is to saye, promises of mercie for all ye repent & knowlege their sinnes at the preachige of ye law & cōsent in their hertes that the law is good, & submitte themselues to be scolers to lern to kepe the lawe & to lerne to beleue ye mercie that is promised thē: & thrīdly the stories & liues of those scolars, both what chaunces fortunēd thē, & also by what meanes their scolemaster taught thē and made them perfecte, & how he tried the true from the false.

“When ye ypocrites come to ye lawe, they put gloses to ād make no moare of it then of a worldly law which is satisfied with ye outward worke and which a turke maye also fulfill. Whē yet Gods law never ceaseth to cōdemne a man vntill it be written in his herte and vntill he kepe it naturally without cōpulsion & all other respecte saue only of pure love to God and his neyboure, as he naturally eateth whē he is an hongred, without cōpulsion & all other respecte, saue to slake his hongre only.

“And whē they come to the Gospell, there they mīgle their leuen & saye, God now receaueth vs even no moare to mercie, but of mercie receaueth vs to penaunce, that is to wete, holy dedes yt make them fatt belies & vs their captiues, both in soule and body. And yet they fayne theyr Idole ye Pope so mercifull, yt if thou make a litle money glisten in his Balams eyes, there is nether penaunce ner purgatory ner any fastige at all but to fle to heven as swefte as a thought and at the twinkellynge of an eye.

“And the liues stories and gestes of men which are cōtayned in the bible, they reade as thiges no moare perteynige vn to them, then a take of Robi hode, & as thiges they wott not wherto they serue, saue to fayne false discāt & iuglinge allegories, to stablish their kingdome with all. And one ye chefest & fleshliet studie they have, is to magnifie the sayntes aboue measure & aboue ye trueth & with their poetrie to make them greater then euer God make them. And if they finde any infirmite or synne ascribed vn to ye saintes, that they excuse with all diligēce, diminushige the glorie of ye mercie of God & robbing wretched sinners of all theyre

cōforte, & thinke therby to flater the sayntes, and to obtayne their fauoure & to make speciall aduocates of thē: even as a man wold obtayne the fauoure of wordely tirantes: as they also fayne the saintes moch moare cruell then ever was any heathē man and moare wrekefull and vengeable than ye poetes faine their godes or their furies yt torment ye soules in hell, if theyr enēs be not fasted & their images visited & saluted wyth a Pater noster (whych prayer only oure lippes be accoynted with our hertes vnderstōdinge none at all) and worsheped wt a candell & ye offerige of oure deuociō, in ye place whiche thei haue chosen to heare ye supplicaciōs & meke peticiōs of their cliētes therin.

"But thou reader thike of ye law of God how yt it is all to gether spirituall, & so spirituall yt it is neuer fulfilled wt dedes or werkes, vntill they flow out of thyne herte wt as greate loue toward thy neybour, for no deseruige of his, ye though he be thine enimie, as Christ loued ye ād did for the, for no deseruige of thyne, but evē whē thou wast his enimie. And in ye meane time, thoroute all our infancie & childhood in Christ, tyll we be growen vpp in to perfecte men in the full knowlege of christ & full loue of christ agayne & of oure neybores for his sake, after ye ensample of his loue to vs, remenbir that ye fulfyllinge of ye law is, a fast fayth in christes bloud coupled wt our professiō & submyttinge our selues to lerne to doo better.

"And of ye Gospell or promises which thou metest in ye scripture, beleue fast yt God will fulfill them vn to ye, and that vn to ye uttermost Jott, at the repentaunce of thyne herte, whē thou turnest to hym & forsakest euell, even of his goodnesse & fatherly mercie unto the, ād not for thy flatterige hym with ypocritish workes of thyne awne fayninge."

To this we add the closing paragraphs:—

"And finally when the rage of thy cōscience is ceased and quieted with fast faith in the promises of mercie, then offer with Jonas the offeringe of prayse and thanksgeuinge, & paye the vow of thy baptim, that God only saueth, of his ōly mercie & goodnesse: that is, beleue stedfastly & preach cōstantly, that it is God only that smyteth, and God only that healeth: ascribynge ye cause of thy tribulation vn to thyne awne synne, and ye cause of thy deliuerance vn to the mercie of God.

"And beware of the leuē yt saith we haue power in oure frewill before ye preachinge of ye Gospell, to deserue grace, to kepe ye lawe, of cōgruite, or god to be vnrightwesse. And saie with Jhon in the first, yt as ye law was geuē by Moses, euē so grace to fulfill it, is geuē by christe. And whē they saye oure dedes with grace deserue heuen, saye thou wt Paule Ro. vi. yt euerlastige life is the gifte of god thorow Jesus Christ oure lorde, & yt we be made sonnes by faith Jhon. i. & therefore heyres of god with christ Ro. viii. And saye that we receaue al of god thorow faith that foloweth repentaunce, & yt we doo not our werkes vn to god, but ether vn to oure selues, to sley ye sinne that remayneth in ye flesh & to waxe perfecte, ether vn to oure neybores which doo as moch for vs agayne in some other thiges. And whē a mā exceedeth in giftes of grace, let hī understōde that they be geuē him, as wel for his weake brethern, as for him selfe: as though all the bred be cōmitted vn to the panter, yet for



his felowes with hym, which geue the thankes vn to theyr lorde, and recompence the panter agayne with other kynde seruice in theyr offices. And when they saye that Christ hath made no satisfaccion for the synne we doo after oure baptym : saye thou wyth the doctrine of Paule, that in oure baptym we receaue the merytes of Christes deeth thorow repentaunce and fayth of which two, baptim is the sygne. And though when we synne of frailtie after oure baptym we receaue the sygne no moare, yet we be renewed agayne thorow repentaunce and fayth in Christes bloude, whych twayne, the sygne of baptym ever continued amonge vs in baptisyng our younge childern doeth euer kepe in mynde and call vs backe agayne vn to oure profession if we be gonne astraye, & promisetht vs forgeuenesse. Nether can actuall synne be washed awaye with oure werkes, but with Christes bloude : nether can there be any other sacrifice or satisfaccion to Godward for them, saue Christes bloude. For as moch as we can doo no werkes vnto God, but receaue only of his mercie with oure repentyng fayth, thorow Jesus Christe oure lorde and only sauer : vn to whom & vn to God oure father thorow him, and vn to hys holy spirite, that only purgeth, sanctifieth & washeth vs in the innocēt bloude of oure redemption, be prayse for ever. Amen."

Of the translation itself we can give no specimens, although it is well deserving of attentive perusal and comparison with the admirable facsimile of Coverdale's *Jonah* from the Bible of 1537, which Mr. Fry has appended to it.

Of the "Proper Dyalogue" we can only speak very briefly. It is a remarkably interesting little composition, and was discovered by Lord Hervey along with the *Jonah*. The date of it is 1530. There is introduced into the dialogue an old treatise ascribed to the reign of Richard the Second, and probably was actually composed at that early period. Another old treatise follows, shewing that we ought to have the Scripture in English. Mr. Fry gives us a very fair account of these in his introduction. Here is a specimen of the dialogue :—

"*Husbondman*.—Prayer? god geue her a shamefull reprefe

For it is the moost briberyng thefe.

That euer was, I make god a vowe.

For by her the clergy without dowte

Robbeth the hole cowntre rounde aboute

Bothe comones and estates none excepte.

I wote they haue prayed so longe all redy

That they haue brought the lande to beggery

And all thryftynes clene awaye swepte.

What soeuer we get with sweate and labour

That prolle they awaye with their prayour

Sayenge they praye for oure soules allwaye

But is their prayer not more awaylyng

To the deade soules, than to the luyng

So is it not worthe a rotten aye.

- " *Gentillman*.—To the soules departed it is not profitable  
 For whye, thos that are in case dampnable  
 No assistance of prayour can attayne.  
 And as for purgatory ther is none  
 Allthough there be clerkes many one  
 Which to seke it take moche payne.
- ' *Husbandman*.—Than I wold their prayenge were at an ende  
 For yf they pray longe thus so god me mende  
 They shall make ye lande worsse than nought.  
 But nowe I will rehearse seriously  
 Howe we husbandemen full pituously  
 Vnto miserable wrechednes are brought.  
 Fyrst whan englonde was in his floures  
 Ordred by the temporall gouernoures  
 Knowenge no spirituall iurisdiccion  
 Than was ther in eche state and degre  
 Haboundance and plentuous prosperite  
 Peaceable welthe without affliction.  
 Noblenes of blood, was had in price  
 Vertuousnes avaunced, hated was vyce  
 Princes obeyd, with due reuerence.  
 Artificers and men of occupacion  
 Quietly wanne their sustentacion  
 Without any grefe of nedy indigence.  
 We husband men lyke wise prosperously  
 Occupyge the feates of husbandry  
 Hyerd fearmes of pryce competent.  
 Wherby oure lyuinge honestly we wanne  
 And had ynough to paye euery manne  
 Helpinge other that were indigent.  
 Tyll at the last the rauenous clergy  
 Through their craftynes and hypocrisie  
 Gate to theym worldly dominacion.  
 Than were we ouercharged very sore  
 Oure fearmes set vp dayly more and more  
 With shamefull pryce in soche a fasshyon.  
 That we paye more nowe by halfe the sune  
 Than a foretymes we dyd of custome  
 Holdinge ought of their possession.  
 Besyde this, other contentes of brybery  
 As payenge of tythes, open and preuy  
 And for herynge of confession.  
 Also prestes dueties and clerkes wages  
 Byenge of perdones and freres quarterages  
 With chirches and aultares reparacion.  
 All oure charges can not be nombred  
 Wherwith we are greatly acombred  
 Ouerwhelmyd with desolacion.  
 We tourmoyle oure selves nyght and daye

And are fayne to dryncke whygge and whaye  
For to maynteyne the clargyes faccioncs."

The next extract is from the old treatise, at the beginning :—

"Where as the clergy perceyueth that lordlynes & worldly dominion can not be borne out bi scripture, thē flie they to argumentes of mēes persuasyon sayenge after thys maner Seynt Huges & seynt Swithune were thus lordes, & in this they ensued Christes luyng & his doctrine, therefore we may be lafully thus lordes. But I wote well that Gabriel shall blowe his horne or they haue proued the minor. That is, that thes sayntes or patrones in this sued the doctrine or the lyfe of Jesu Christe. And of this thou mayst se that soch argumentes that ar not clothed with Christes luyng or his teachinge, be right nought worthe although the clerkes blynde with thē moch folke in ye world. But here haue I no leyser to tell though I coude, what chesauce and costes the churche maketh and what werres they hold to cōtynue this symony and heresy so vnauisely brought into ye chirche. And yet they seke all the wayes therto that they can. Ye in so moch that they go opely armyd in to the felde to kyll christen men, for to get and holde soche lordshippe. And notwithstandinge seynt Peter was so pore that he had nether golde nor syluer as

Act. iii. he saieth in the Actes of the apostles. And his other worldly good he left, whan he beganne to sue Christe. And as towchynge the tytle of worldly lawe that he had to soch worldly goodes, he made neuer cleyne ne neuer resceyued after any worldly lordshippe. And yet they call all their hole kingdom seynt Peters grounde or lordshippe.

Libro. ii. And therfor seynt Bernarde writeth to Eugenie ye pope sayenge. Yf thou wilt be a lorde, seke by another waye to attayne it, but not by thys apostles ryght For he may not geue the that he had not, that he had he gaue, the whiche was busynes vpon chirches. Whether he gaue

i. Petri. lordshippe or no, here what he saieth. Be ye not lordes in the clergy, but be ye made forme and example off Christes flocke. And least ye trowe thys be not sayde of trothe take kepe what Christe saieth in ye gospell. The kinges of hethen haue lordshippe vpon theym, forsothe ye not so. Se howe playnly lordshippe is forboden to all apostles, for yf thou be a lorde howe darest thou take vpon the apostleshypp, or yf thou be a bysshoppe, howe darest thou take vpon the lordship? Playnly thou art forboden bothe. And yf thou wylt haue bothe to gether thou shalt lese bothe, and be of the nomber, of whych god pleineth by the prophete Osee sayenge. They reygnyd but not by me sayeth god. And yf we holde that, that is forboden, here we that is boden of Chryste. He that is greatest of you se yt he be made as younger in symplenes, and he that is a fore goere loke he be as a seruaunt. Thys is ye forme of apostles lyfe, lordshyppes forboden and seruys is boden thys sayeth saynt Bernerde there. And therfor no man may put a nother grounde besydes yt that is put whych is Christe Jesu."

The following is the conclusion of the "Compendious old treatise, shewing how that we ought to have the Scripture in English" :—

"Also we take ensample of holy virgyns to loue to reade the gospell as they diden, as Katheryn, Cecyle, Lucye, Agnes, Margaret, whiche alegyd the holy gospell to the infidels, that slewe them for the keping therof. Of these foresaid auctorites it is prouyd lauffull, that both men and women lauffully may reade and wryte gods lawe in their mother tonge, and they that forfenden this they shewe them selves heyers and sonnes of the first tormentors, and werse, for they shewen them selves the veraye disciples of Antichrist, whiche hathe and shall passe all the malyce of tyrauntes that haue ben before in stoppyng and peruertyng of gods lawe whiche deade engendrythe greate vengeaunce to fall in this realme, but yf it be amendid For Paule saithe Roma. i. The wrathe of god is shewyd from heyn vpon cruelnes & vnryghtfulnes of these men that with holden the trowthe of god in vnryght wysnes, Reuelatur enim ira dei super omnem impietatē et iniusticiam hominum eorum qui veritatem dei in iniustitia detinent. Now god of hys mercy geue vnto ower kyng, and to ower lordes grace of trewe vnderstandyng to amende this default principally and all other, then shall we mowe easely to be amendid. For vntyll it be amendid there shall neuer be restand peace in thys realme. Who that fyndythe or redythe this lettre put it furthe in examinacyon and suffer it not to be hydde or destroyed, but multiplyed for no man knoweth what proffyt maye come therof. For he that compiled it, purposyth with goddes helpe to mayntayne it vnto the deathe, yf neade be. And therefore all christen men and women, praye that ye worde of god maye be vn-bounde, and deliuered from the power of Antichrist, and renne amonge his people. Amen."

Our readers will join us in thanking Mr. Fry for the zeal, skill, and disinterestedness with which he has performed his task. We are sure he will never be repaid in a worldly point of view for his great expense and labour: but he will have the satisfaction of knowing that he has multiplied, and so preserved from destruction, documents of the profoundest interest in connection with the cause of God's truth and of Christian liberty in this country.

Q.

---

*The Loss of the Soul.*—What, if it be lawful to indulge such a thought, what would be the funeral obsequies of a lost soul? Where shall we find the tears fit to be wept at such a spectacle; or could we realize the calamity in all its extent, what tokens of commiseration and concern would be deemed equal to the occasion? Would it suffice for the sun to veil his light, and the moon her brightness; to cover the ocean with mourning, and the heavens with sack-cloth; or were the whole fabric of nature to become animated and vocal, would it be possible for her to utter a groan too deep, or a cry too piercing, to express the magnitude and extent of such a catastrophe?—*R. Hall.*

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND GENESIS IX. 6.<sup>a</sup>

IF capital punishment for murder be in truth required by a divine command given to the whole human race in the person of Noah, there can be no doubt in the mind of any right thinking person as to its universal obligation and expediency, in this and every other time. If, on the contrary, it be first met with under the Jewish dispensation, it may be fairly argued to be like all the other criminal legislation of Moses, transitory and special, that which "hath been in old time," but which need not apply now. The oft-quoted passage in Gen. ix. 6, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," is thus the stronghold of those who regard this mode of punishment as of divine obligation in modern times; if not indeed the only basis for their position. The doubts which have of late years arisen, as to the expediency of retaining death as a legal punishment, have hence naturally caused many to doubt whether the current interpretation of that text be indeed the true one. The question is an important one, and the evidence on either side deserves a careful and impartial consideration.

It is manifest, at the first glance, that the words as they stand are capable of two very diverse explanations; each, however, perfectly natural and legitimate. They may be viewed either as a command or as a prediction,—an injunction upon man to visit with death the sin of murder upon the murderer, or a warning to man that if he slew his brother he would, in the course of God's providence, meet a like fate himself. Nor does a reference to the original Hebrew in any way help to decide the point, as the future tense (here employed) is habitually used to express both ideas,—obligation and futurity. The text is nowhere cited or referred to in other parts of Scripture; no authoritative interpretation of it exists. Equally vain is it to seek for grounds of argument in the general tenour of the passage where it occurs; for this contains, besides these disputed words, both command and prophecy; and either sense would be, for the special circumstances when the words were spoken, equally appropriate. This being so, there remain but two modes in which the doubt can be resolved:—1. A careful examination of the immediate context (having reference to the same subject); and 2. A comparison of other places in Scripture, where similar phraseology is employed. Let us briefly apply these two tests to the decision of the point at issue.

1. *The context.*—The whole passage concerning blood-shedding runs as follows. "And surely your blood of your souls will

---

<sup>a</sup> See *J. S. Lit.*, July 1864, p. 314.

I require; at the hand of every living thing will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every one, his brother, will I require the soul of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made He man." Of the meaning of the first part of the passage, there can be no doubt; it is a declaration of God to man concerning His providential government, to shew the sacredness of human life in His eyes, and set at rest the natural fears for their safety, which might have arisen in the breast of Noah and his sons. Just as when Cain trembled for his life God gave him the assurance, "whosoever slayeth Cain, it shall be avenged sevenfold," so here He promised to the little remnant escaped from the flood, that if any slew them, be it man or animal, He would demand their blood at the hand of the slayer. Here certainly is no word of capital punishment as a human institution, but only of divine protection exercising the divine prerogative of vengeance. For here is no mention of man punishing, but of God requiring; and that too both from man and beast,—from "every living thing." If capital punishment *were* intended, then is it of equal obligation in the case of beasts as of man. And if, on account of this passage, it is the duty of every government to execute such punishment on every *man* who slays his fellow, so is it equally its duty in regard to "every living thing." Of the purely declaratory or predictive character of this portion of the text, then, there can be no doubt.

Now, how are the following words connected on to these? A shedding of man's blood is spoken of; a parallel phrase, undoubtedly, to the "blood of your souls," immediately before; but of the *shedder* no hint is given. The sufferer is clearly defined,—"*man's* blood;" and the avenger,—"*by man* shall his blood be shed;" but the murderer is unnoticed. It is not, "if a *man* shed his brother's blood," but "whoso sheddeth," or, as it is literally, "the *shedder* of man's blood, his blood by man shall be shed" (שֹׁפֵךְ דַּם הָאָדָם בְּאָדָם דָּמוֹ יִשְׁפָּךְ). Whence then are we to learn who is intended? Clearly from the preceding context, where the same subject has been already dwelt upon. And who are there spoken of as the slayers of man, from whom God assures Noah and his sons that He will require "the blood of their souls?" Man and beast, every living thing. But if both man and beast are thus the subjects of the first part, then clearly must both also be included in the term "*shedder*." Both are spoken of as depriving man of life, of both will God demand that life; both then will God punish, and both in the same way,—"*by man* shall their blood be shed." The connection between the two clauses necessitating thus the inclusion of

beasts in the "whoso" of the second, the same difficulty arises as before. If these words be a command for capital punishment, then should that punishment be extended to animals as well as to men; the obligation to both is exactly equal. But if this idea be rejected as untenable and absurd (as it must), then is the passage no command at all, but only a prediction.

And hereby is the harmony of the whole much better preserved. Instead of a vague promise of divine protection, followed by an equally vague command for human vengeance, we have a full, explicit, and well-ordered warning. First God sets forth His purpose of avenging human blood, and its universal application; then, secondly, proceeds to speak of the nature of that vengeance, and the agent by whom it shall be wrought; concluding, lastly, with His reason for so acting. And if further proof be needed of the true meaning of the passage, we have it in this divine reason,—“in the image of God made He man.” For (1) this reason applies with equal force to every case of blood-shedding, whether by man or beast; God’s image is marred by murder, therefore the murderer (whoever he be) must die: thus shewing again that there is no narrowing of the meaning merely to human murderers in the second clause. And (2) this reason is essentially a divine one, not a human. Man punishes from feelings of revenge, or out of self-defence; God avenges on account of the sin against Himself. Much more then should this be the reason alleged for a divine course of action, than for a human ordinance. It is only by separating Gen. ix. 6 from its context, that it can be made to appear a command. Viewed with its context, it is unquestionably part of a prediction.

But it may be said, does not such a prediction, referring to certain acts of man, which it is the will of God should follow upon certain other acts, in itself impose a sort of obligation upon man to fulfil it, or at all events not to do anything which should prevent its fulfilment, as the abolition of capital punishment would that of the one in question. The fallacy of such a line of reasoning is easily exposed. For (1) this view of the matter still leaves the great difficulty,—the inclusion of beasts equally with man, altogether untouched; since if such a prediction impose an obligation on man to fulfil it, it does so as much in the case of animals generally, as of man. And (2) it is a principle which no one would dare to apply to predictions generally, even when couched in precisely similar terms to that in the text; and which cannot therefore be consistently adopted here. To illustrate this, and at the same time test yet further the accuracy of the view just enunciated, as to the true meaning of the text, it may be well to glance for a moment at these parallel passages.

II. *Parallel passages.*—The construction of the words in Gen. ix. 6 is peculiar and well marked. A certain evil act is described,—that same evil act, it is then asserted, shall recoil upon the doer. Are there any other similarly constructed texts in Scripture?—and if so, are they commands or predictions; do they involve obligation or not? In the Book of Proverbs there are four such, in every respect precisely similar. They are as follows:—

Prov. xvii. 13. "Whoso rewardeth evil for good, evil shall not depart from his house."

Prov. xxi. 13. "Whoso stoppeth his ears at the cry of the poor, he also shall cry himself, and not be heard."

Prov. xxvi. 27. "Whoso diggeth a pit shall fall therein; and he that rolleth a stone, it will return upon him."

Prov. xxviii. 10. "Whoso causeth the righteous to go astray in an evil way, he shall fall himself into his own pit."

Are these commands? Do they impose any obligation upon individuals or governments for their fulfilment? Surely not; and yet they are exactly parallel to Gen. ix. 6; nor can any passage be found with this particular mode of construction, throughout the whole Old Testament, in which is one word of obligation;—one and all are warnings to evil-doers, comforts to innocent sufferers. But some may say, these verses in Proverbs are mere axioms of the wise king; the text in Genesis is the direct utterance of God. Without pausing to notice the tacit denial of the divine authority of Proverbs, which such an objection involves, it will be sufficient to refute it by a reference to two equally parallel passages in the New Testament, to which it does not apply.

Matth. xxvi. 52. "All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."

Rev. xiii. 10. "He that leadeth into captivity shall go into captivity; he that killeth with the sword must be killed with the sword."

Here are direct divine utterances, again exactly similar to that in Gen. ix. 6, yet which none would dare to construe as commands. Now these parallel passages may teach us several things concerning the text in Genesis. (1.) This form of construction being thus exclusively used to express predictions, it is most improbable that it should have been adopted here, had a command been intended. Had this been the case, we should certainly have expected to find "the man who sheds man's blood shall surely be put to death," or some other of the ordinary forms of language in which capital punishment is enjoined. (2.) The sinfulness there would be in presuming to become the exe-



cutants of the divine purposes set forth in such predictions (without express command to that effect), in the other instances, proves that they cannot have been given to man as guides or warrants for their fulfilment; but merely as warnings to him not to incur the threatened punishment, or, if the sufferer, to leave the vengeance to Him to whom it rightfully belongs. Are we to refuse help to a covetous man reduced to poverty,—to shut our ears to his cry, because he did so formerly to others? Are we to return evil for evil to every one who returned evil for good,—to persecute all cruel unjust men unceasingly? Are we to seek to ensnare all those who seek to ensnare us? Because at various times the followers of Christ have, contrary to His command, resorted to violence and carnal weapons to strengthen or defend His Church,—is hereby any warrant given for haters of that Church to cause it to perish by like carnal weapons and violence? What though the saints be slain and led captive,—shall any man presume on this account to slay and lead captive their oppressors? Dare we plead for such actions a divine obligation, or even approval? No:—man is the instrument of vengeance truly, but let him not arrogate to himself the guiding of the stroke. For, (3), a comparison of these predictions with the facts of the world's history shews, that while in many striking cases accurately fulfilled, they yet in many others fail of accomplishment. How many persecutors, both in the Church and out of it, have failed to feel in their own persons the woes they wrought for others? How many rich misers have died in their wealth, and never needed to cry for help? How many murderers died natural deaths? In every case the same discrepancy between the exact words of the prediction, and the facts of the cases referred to, is apparent. And why is this? Not surely because God is unable to carry out His own purposes, but because these passages were never intended to foretell irrevocably the fate of those they concern; but merely to point out the ordinary natural consequences to which they had by their act exposed themselves, and which they might, therefore, justly expect would actually befall them. All are but particular applications of that one great fundamental rule of God's providence,—“as a man soweth, so shall he reap.” Each man's sin will find him out; the violent dealing of each will return upon his own pate. So Jacob found it when he deceived his father, and was himself deceived by Laban, and his own sons. So David found it, when he committed adultery with Bath-sheba, and saw his own wives and concubines ravished by Absalom. Yet who should dare to say, in any particular case, it *must* be so? Even so is it with murder; the warning that the shedder of human blood shall forfeit his life, imposes no obliga-

tion, demands of us no action, except the abstaining alike from murder and from revenge; permits us not even to regard it as certain that every murderer shall so perish. Vengeance is God's; and though man be His chosen instrument of executing it, yet do the time, the manner, and the subjects of that vengeance, belong exclusively to Him.

To argue from this that capital punishment for murder was an interference with God's providential government, would be as absurd as to argue that its abolition could in any way frustrate His eternal purposes. There is abundant Scripture evidence to shew that such punishment is *lawful*, albeit none to prove it *obligatory*. Every government is at liberty to adopt or reject it, as it sees right, or as the circumstances of the time require. It may be in most cases expedient, and so God accomplish through it his purpose; but this implies neither warrant or approval, any more than in the parallel case of individual revenge, which equally accomplishes it, yet which we should be loath to say God sanctions. If any government should, on the ground of this statement in Genesis, adopt or retain capital punishment, and thus arrogate to itself the office of the executor of God's wrath, without express warrant, then indeed it would be guilty of presumption; but not else. Now under the Mosaic dispensation this warrant was given; the punishments which God awards were formally entrusted to man to execute. Therefore was it, that not only murder, but idolatry, blasphemy, Sabbath-breaking, disobedience to parents, adultery, were all punishable with death;—that false-witnesses received the punishment they had hoped to bring upon others;—that thefts were to be restored fourfold, and so the sufferer's loss transferred to the thief;—that retribution in kind was extended to cases of maiming as well as murder;—that, in fine, the shedding of man's blood brought down the penalty of death, not only in the case of man, but of *beasts* also. Under the Mosaic code *sins* were punished, not *crimes*, in accordance with that principle of direct divine government which formed the basis and corner-stone of the whole system. But this state of things no longer exists, and so this criminal legislation is no longer obligatory. That death is the final punishment awarded by God for murder, as for all sin, we still are taught; and that, for the sake of more especial retribution, He provides that it shall, as a general rule, be violent death, wrought by human hands, we still believe; but beyond this, find no Scripture warrant that concerns us now.

A LAYMAN.

---

## POPULAR INFIDELITY IN THE METROPOLIS:

## AN UNWRITTEN CHAPTER IN CONTEMPORARY HISTORY.

"We are entering on a new era in theology. The carping and false criticism of the last age, with its sensual wit and political selfishness, were not always wisely, even if for the time successfully, dealt with by the defenders of the faith. Another generation, however, has arisen; and the real and sincere dealing with all questions of moral and religious import cannot (let us hope) be averted. Objections, difficulties, theories and counter theories, seem destined to find their honest level. Facts will be ascertained, and thoughts will work their penetrating way; and let us trust that there will be no turning back. For the Catholic faith and its true interpretation we have no fear."<sup>a</sup>

THE opinion expressed in this quotation is probably a very prevalent one, and to some extent, but only to some extent, it is correct. In the upper strata, as we may call them, of doubt and unbelief, there is certainly every appearance of a disposition to conduct controversy on purer and more honourable principles. But in the lower strata of doubt and unbelief these hopeful signs are by no means always visible; on the contrary, coarse and vulgar invective, carping and false criticism, sensual wit, and political selfishness, are lamentably common. The writings and the language of Thomas Paine are still current among the uneducated advocates of scepticism and infidelity. The sheer dishonesty and angry prejudice of the Rev. Robert Taylor still pervert the minds of many, and his *Diegesis* and *Syntagma* furnish the students of bitter incredulity with text-books. Mr. G. J. Holyoake claims to be exceptionally polite among modern living "secularists;" but his fellow-worker, if not his colleague, Mr. Bradlaugh, *alias* "Iconoclast," rejoices in the crushing weight of his invectives, and the overwhelming torrents of sarcasm and denunciation which he launches against religion. As are the apostles, so are the disciples. Here and there one calmly, quietly, and even courteously propounds his principles; but there are more who have no such self-control, and who ignorantly and furiously rave against all Christians and all Christianity, and often against the very being of a God, and what used to be regarded as the elements of natural religion. We have reason to believe that like differences appear in the lives of these men. Some allow of no law of moral conduct beyond that of expediency. Others claim the possession of an inward faculty—whether reason or a moral sense—by means of which they discern right from wrong, and are directed to choose the good and to avoid the evil. Others again, simply and broadly build on

---

<sup>a</sup> *Literary Churchman*, May 21, 1864.

<sup>b</sup> *Aliases* among infidels or secularists are very common.

the foundation of gross materialism, and affirm that every man is what he is and does what he does as a mere result of organization: hence virtue merits no praise, and vice no blame, except in so far as this, that somehow or other, in early life at least, a man's tendencies resulting from organization may be modified by education. This materialism is extensively prevalent in the metropolis, to which our observations apply, and shews itself in the most grotesque and vulgar, nay, monstrous forms. Under its influence, one man becomes a pantheist, and another an atheist; one and all deny the existence of spirit and of mind as distinct from matter. It is not possible that the low materialist should believe himself endowed with a soul, and destined to immortality. Thus God and the soul, death, resurrection, judgment, heaven, hell, sin, holiness, nature, and a thousand other great realities and truths, are either summarily dismissed, or utterly transformed, by some eccentric explanation.

The secondary causes of the unbelief which is so common among the working and trading classes, are of course the same essentially as in other grades of society: but with some differences. Ignorance of the true teaching of Scripture, and of the nature of language and of evidence; as well as ignorance of many other things that are important, is one of the most prominent reasons for this hostility to the Bible, to churches, to Christians, to everything with which the idea of religion is connected. Another cause, or a branch of this, is illustrated by Pope's well-known line:—

“A little knowledge is a dangerous thing.”

Certain men have got a little knowledge of scientific objections, of critical difficulties, of various readings, of Bishop Colenso and Sir C. Lyell, of Strauss and Renan, of Darwin, and a host of other matters. They have learned quite enough to excite or to confirm their suspicions, but they are utterly without the means of investigating properly the truth of what they suspect. They are able to frame objections, and there is something extraordinary in the facility with which they will throw out a whole string of these objections. It is lamentable to think that while they can do this, and can feel all the force of the objections, they do not know enough frequently to appreciate a reply.

“Hence oft, objection calls us out  
To satisfy the blockhead's doubt,  
Who not one proof, whereon depends  
The sought solution, comprehends.”

Or to quote a French writer whom this author paraphrases:

"Tous ceux qui sont capable de faire des objections, ne sont pas toujours en état de comprendre tous les principes dont depend la resolution de leur objections."<sup>c</sup> Blank ignorance and partial knowledge present enormous difficulties which few can realize who have not attempted their removal. However incredible it may seem, we have known a railing rejector of all religion object to it on the ground of its absurdity. The case adduced by him in proof arose out of our Saviour's declaration in John iii. to Nicodemus: "The parsons tell us," said this unhappy man, "that we must be born again. I should like to know how that can be. I was born once, and I don't see how I can be born again," etc. Not satisfied with this, the same individual denounced the doctrine of a resurrection and a future life, declaring that he did not believe that once dead he should live again, unless it was by becoming the food of loathsome creatures.

The case just quoted may be deemed an exception. Alas! it could be easily paralleled by examples of equal brutishness. But suppose it represents the lowest level; ought we not to know what that is, though it shews us men who have little that is human except the form? When crass ignorance and impenetrable stupidity are combined, it is all but impossible for any human teaching to prevail except by very slow and almost imperceptible degrees. When, however, deep-rooted prejudice and immoral principles characterize the ignorant and stupid man, the case is almost hopeless. Yet even this is not uncommon. As regards prejudice, it is something wonderful in its depth and intensity. There is no possibility of hope that the slave of prejudice will be reached by rational argument: sarcasm and invective wisely and cautiously employed may touch him, and as a rule will do so more than any representations of divine love, or declarations of a personal desire for the good of the wretched individual. How to expel this demon of prejudice is a serious problem, and a hopeless one unless we know its causes as well as its results. "Turn out old Prejudice," said one of the preachers of the school to which Rowland Hill belonged; "turn out old Prejudice; he's got no eyes, nor no ears." We may further illustrate this from the anonymous poet already quoted:

"For dusky green, the jaundiced eye  
Mistakes the clear blue summer sky,—  
The distant scene, however bright,  
Is darkness to the short of sight,—

---

<sup>c</sup> "Not all those who are able to make objections are always in a position to comprehend all the principles upon which the resolution of their objections depends." See *Epistles, Philosophical and Moral*: London, 1759: pp. 59, 60. A set of freethinking satires in verse, but not without ability.

To loaded ears, as whispers still,  
The clack and thunder of the mill :  
Thus lost, as colours on the blind,  
On dulness, qualities refined ;  
Than music to the deaf, no more  
To ignorance the abstracted lore."

The prejudiced infidel is often furious in his denunciations of the Bible and of Christianity. Hence it is not uncommon to find a man labouring to prove the Bible "that abominable book," and to shew that Christians must necessarily also be abominable in proportion as they carry it out. Your clever, witty, rhetorical atheist can wind up an harangue by declaring of Holy Scripture that "it is all evil and no good, all false and none true." This reckless lying, this monstrous and impudent assertion of what is not true, and known to be not true, is a chronic disease of infidelity. An experience of several months among them, and every opportunity of hearing all they could possibly say against religion, has left upon the writer's mind a conviction of infidel dishonesty which time will never remove, and which is fully justified by concessions made by men of their own party. This deliberate refusal to see the truth and to say the truth on the part of avowed truth-seekers, is intimately connected with prejudice. Sometimes it is the natural result of avowed immoral principles. Without going over the catalogue of vices, let us give one illustration. Observe, all these men are the champions of TRUTH. Many know that among recent controversies in the upper regions of literature, there has been one upon the subject of lying and deceit. Certain Protestants have accused certain Roman Catholics of teaching at least equivocation, and in theory violating the sanctity of truth. There ought to have been no controversy upon the subject perhaps, because the question was disposed of in the abstract as long since as Pascal's time. Dr. Newman might have said, "I do not allow that a man may practise equivocation and deceit, because although St. Liguori has said this may be done *ex justa causa*, I don't believe a *justa causa* can possibly arise." However, he has written a very remarkable book, and one that would have got him a place in the cells of the Inquisition if he had written it under certain other circumstances. As it is, we expect to hear the volume gets a niche *inter libros prohibitos*. Well, this question of the sanctity of truth has several times come up in our hearing, and on two occasions certainly it was laid down that a man was justified in lying if he found it expedient. This is what we call an immoral principle, and in each instance it was only discovered by detecting the speaker in a falsehood, and by at

once questioning him as to his views on the general question. On a third occasion the principle was illustrated in this way: the speaker declared that a disputant need acknowledge the truth of nothing which destroyed his arguments, and that his supreme aim should be to gain the victory in debate; that to effect this he ought to ignore whatever favoured that which he opposed, and to put in the strongest form all that could be devised against it. We have already mentioned Robert Taylor as practising deception and misrepresentation, and we have found similar conduct so common as to authorize us in tracing it to an immoral principle extensively recognized among low class infidels.

A very frequent case connected with this point is that dogged perverseness which refuses to put a candid construction upon anything, and which turns everything to the account of unbelief. This also we shall illustrate by a recent example. It is well known that Dean Alford has written a paper in Dr. Guthrie's *Sunday Magazine*, in which he speaks of the erroneous readings and renderings of the Authorized Version of the Bible. This article fell into the hands of one of our unbelieving acquaintance, and was found to contain an unlimited supply of concessions favourable to infidelity. Next Sunday our objector makes his appearance in the chosen arena for the out-door mission of infidelity. He taxes Christians with hypocrisy and fraud, and declares on the authority of Dean Alford, that what goes into the hands of women and children as God's word is merely a human invention. We had not then read the Dean's article, but knowing the facts of the case, and knowing too that he was too honest and too wise a man to say what was so vague and absurd, we confidently denounced the statement as a gross perversion, and insisted upon the production of what Dr. Alford had said. In this we succeeded, and the magazine, crumpled, soiled, and pencil-marked, issued at last from a pocket where it had kept company with far different characters. Now, said we, you will please to read what the Dean has said. This he, however, would not do; but eventually allowed it to be read. The passage was this:—"A formidable list of passages might be given, in which our version either has confessedly misrendered the original, or has followed a form of the text now well known not to have been the original form. These might be corrected at any time: and it is a grievous thing that this has not been done, and is not now doing. For, as matters now stand, we are printing for reading in our churches, we are sending forth into the cottage and the mansion, books containing passages and phrases which pretend to be the Word of God and are not; and that, when the remedy is easy, and lies at any time in our

power." These words are true, if somewhat unguarded, and we honour him who could be so courageous as to speak them. But we may add that the propagation of this knowledge will compel the churches in self-defence to labour for the production of a better version from a purer text. But to continue our narration. We were asked what honesty there could be in the translators who mixed up with God's Word what was man's word. We replied they were honest, and gave the best translation in their power, but since the year 1611 several important events have occurred. 1. Some words and phrases have either changed their meaning, or lost it by going out of use. For example, "to take thought," in the text, "Take no thought for the morrow;" again, "sincere" in the passage, "Desire the sincere milk of the word." Now, "to take thought," was "to be anxious," or "filled with care;" and "sincere" meant "pure," or "unadulterated." For these changes, the translators cannot be blamed, because the nation itself has made them since. 2. A considerable number of very ancient manuscripts of the Greek New Testament have been discovered, and compared with one another since our Version was made, and modern critics, by comparing these, have inferred that the text of our translation is not so perfect as it might now be made. Here we called attention to some of the objectionable readings which we had marked in a Greek Testament then in our pocket. We proceeded: 3. Modern scholarship is much in advance of that of the period at which our translators laboured. The scientific study of languages has helped us to see more clearly the meaning of particular portions of ancient documents. The investigation of the topography, the botany, the natural history of Bible countries has also enabled us to correct a number of circumstantial errors. There may still be other reasons to account for what Dean Alford so frankly calls attention to, and no honest man of sense can get mischief out of his words.

The only reply to all this was, that "the Holy Ghost ought to have kept the translators from error; and that the clergy found it to their interest to keep the people in ignorance." We call this perverseness, an obstinate refusal or inability to put the right construction upon facts and language.

One of the most prevalent objections to religion seems to be traceable to the errors and inconsistencies of Christians. The divisions of sects and the strife of parties supply an inexhaustible theme. Which *religion* are they to follow, that of the Roman Catholic, of the Greek, of the Churchman, of the Presbyterian, of the Independent, of the Baptist, of the Methodist, etc., etc.?



Sometimes the list will take in Buddhism, Hinduism, Mahomedanism, and so forth. The conclusion is, that because all cannot be every way right, none are right. It is not seen that Deism, Pantheism, or Atheism, are additional systems of opinion upon religion, and that he who is consistent should reject them too, because they differ from one another, and from the rest. But the truth is that much of this denunciation of sects and religions is pretence, and what is vulgarly called humbug, a mere excuse for impiety. With reference to the faults of the Church, we admit their grievousness, and cannot but wail over them before God and men. It is a horrible thing that avowed members of the Church should so live and act as to make the Church the laughing-stock of the infidel. It is a terrible thing that within the same Church, the scornful finger of infidelity can point to Brother Ignatius, to Bishop Colenso, and to the Dean of Ripon, and ask which holds the doctrine of the Church, or has the Church no doctrine at all? The happy-family principle after all, when pushed to this excess, only excites the scorn and contempt of the mocking blasphemer. Along with these things, we hear of pluralities, non-residence, nepotism, simony, fox-hunting parsons, and whatever else is mean or questionable among the clergy. Tithes and church rates, and all compulsion in religious matters form an endless fund of ridicule and reproach. The evil lives, the grasping avarice, the tricks of trade, the political selfishness, the occasional immorality of professed Christians, are hurled as so much mire against Christianity, and declared to be good reasons for rejecting it. Can Christians treat all this with indifference? Let the churches beware lest the blood of souls be upon them. Some other real or alleged causes of scepticism and infidelity may be found in the ensuing description of a few scenes which have been witnessed in the metropolis during 1864. We may as well say, that the place referred to is in the north-east of London, and that the transactions referred to occurred before midsummer last. The debates were first observed by us in May, and they continued without intermission on Sundays down to the end of October. From 11 A.M. until 10 P.M. during most of that time, these discussions were maintained. The writer of this paper was anxious to know what infidelity and doubt among the working classes had to say, and how it would listen to information and reason. He therefore determined to throw aside every personal consideration and try what he could do. He had formerly done the same thing elsewhere, and his success then induced him to try again. The effort was made, and one result has been an initiation into all that these deluded and misguided men have to

say upon religion: a second result has been the actual communication of many items of knowledge to which those who assembled were and would have remained strangers. As for direct personal results, if there has been no striking "conversion" to record, there has been a general moderating of the wrath of the enemies, and much more which need not be here recorded. The general result is, that the truth has nothing to fear from publicity; but everything to fear from being kept back. On the whole the writer feels that he has not sacrificed his comfort in vain, and has much cause to be thankful for the help which God has given him, and the impressions which have been produced on many minds.

There is assuredly a necessity for a return to the practice and tactics of earlier times. Infidelity, in the name of science, philosophy, truth-seeking, secularism, freethinking, or what not, is rampant in our metropolis among the industrial classes, and men, women, and children, are drinking in the poison, in full draughts of obscene blasphemy, or in the more diluted form of simple rationalism, which—

" — Sweet religion makes  
A rhapsody of words."

And perhaps some of them may have to say, like the ghost in Hamlet,—

" 'Upon my secure hour' the sceptic 'stole  
With juice of cursed hebenon in a vial,  
And in the porches of mine ears did pour  
The leperous distilment.' "

Infidelity in every degree openly and unblushingly takes the Christian's day of rest, and the Christian Bible, and uses them for mockery, ribaldry, blasphemy, and all evil. Will the churches allow this to continue? Will they circulate either no books on Christian evidences, or only such as belong to an utterly different state of things? Will they allow the wolf to come and steal away their flocks for whom Christ died, and to steal them not by ones and twos but by thousands? Will they not go out into the wilderness, and into the highways and hedges like the Master? Is routine and custom to be followed eternally and at all risks? or will the Church turn out of its rut and follow those who will not follow it? Is the Church to abide in almost universal ignorance of the actual forms and reasons, language and results of a wide-spread infidelity which is appalling? There is something wrong in the Church, or those who have been baptized at her fonts, taught in her Sunday-schools, confirmed by her bishops, and finally presented with Bibles and Prayer-books,

would not laugh at all their obligations, and hold up those very Bibles and Prayer-books as emanating from gigantic fraud, and upholding the most monstrous delusions. Yet such is the case, and all this time most of the shepherds and their flocks which remain are content to jog along in the old way, as if wanderers and deceivers were alike unresistingly to be surrendered to the devil, and to perdition. They avoid these poor wretches; assuredly they do, but so did the priest and the Levite avoid the robbed and wounded man. Will no good Samaritan come and help those whom sin and Satan have robbed of their faith, and wounded in their souls?

Books will do something, but they cannot be written fitly, until our best and wisest men will come down and learn from their own lips what these unhappy souls think, and feel, and speak. If this is not done, society will be revenged: there is a "Nemesis of Faith." But how converse with such men? First of all, you must endeavour to talk as they talk when they talk their best; you must use all your learning and wisdom, and make it as plain, and put it as forcibly as possible; nor need you fear a certain use of irony and sarcasm, but this must be with caution. Deny nothing that is true, and state every question honestly and candidly. Treat every man with all kindness, courtesy, and respect, but be quite sure that unless you have something real and solid and earnest to give, you will have no chance of success. You must be tolerably familiar with the history of infidelity as well as of Christianity; you must especially be acquainted with the general history of controversy upon Christian evidences, from the apostolic fathers down to such discussions as those about *Essays and Reviews*, Renan, Strauss, and Bishop Colenso, all of whom are regarded as favouring infidelity in important particulars. You must be able to sustain any doctrinal statement by Scripture texts fairly interpreted. It will be ruinous for you to neglect acquaintance with various schools of philosophy, the principles of logic, and general science. But above all, your Bible must be like George Herbert's pulpit, "your joy and your throne." If you know Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin, you will find them useful. You must familiarise yourselves with various readings and disputed translations, and most of the topics illustrated by a good Scripture introduction, and a good edition of the Greek Testament. Familiarity with figurative, typical, and emblematical terms, with prophecies and their fulfilment, with miracles and the discussions upon them, with the literary history of the canon and of separate books, with supposed contradictions, inconsistencies, immoral, cruel, and unjust maxims, etc., will all be in constant

requisition. Great and frequent use may be made of an acquaintance with other religions, Buddhism, and Paganism, and Islam. You may be decided for your own Church, but you must be tolerant and gentle towards others. But no zeal nor charity in regard to Church principles will avail, if you are not boldly and in all things one who loves, believes, and honours Christ, who accepts the Bible as the supreme rule of faith and law of life, and earnestly desires the present and eternal welfare of men.

In drawing these observations to a close, a few things must be said. These remarks are not intended as a full statement in any department touched upon, they are intended rather to suggest to those whose duties and other circumstances prevent them from knowing what transpires out of doors on Sunday, that something must be done to stay the evil of which we speak. We do not advocate suppression, this would only lash them to fury; and let those who go to bind the monster beware of his tail. Suppression will not do, there is a more excellent way, the way of charity. Although the men who have been imprisoned for religious opinions during the last half century can be counted upon one's fingers, these men can count them, and fling them in the teeth of those who preach a religion of love. What we think would do good with the blessings of God's Holy Spirit, may be gathered from what precedes. Return to primitive practice we say: let Paul and Barnabas go to Mars' Hill, the school of Tyrannus, the market-place, and let them speak and preach and dispute as they did eighteen centuries ago; they will find Jews and Greeks enough to reason with: let our Apologists, our Quadratus, and Aristides, Melito and Justin, Tatian and Athenagoras, even our Origen, our Tertullian, and our Lactantius come out of their cells, and oppose infidelity, not that of mouldering books, and of dead men, but that of the living Phygellus and Hermogenes, Celsus and Porphyry.

We trust that the guardians and friends of religion, virtue, knowledge, and all who love their country, will combine to try if, under God, they cannot bring to an end the scandalous and disgraceful scenes which we do not apologise for transcribing in these pages.

\* \* \* \*

It is Sunday morning, and the temple-worshippers are wending homewards. But yonder, by the wayside, is a considerable group of persons, to and from which individuals are incessantly passing. Let us approach and examine it more closely. We soon find that it is composed of a number of knots of people, so that while in appearance but one assembly, it is in reality a con-

geries of assemblies. In the centre of each of these knots of people two or more persons appear, and they are clearly the principal objects of interest. There is a confused hum of voices, the ring of a laugh, a general murmur, or a distinct utterance. All these come in turn, and generally two or three of them go on together. The spectators and auditors are evidently not all equally interested. Some of them stay but a moment or two; others keep skirmishing about the outside, and among these are probably candidates for popular attention waiting for their opportunity. Ever and anon one of the lesser groups breaks up and its members are apparently absorbed in the mass. Ever and anon, too, a part of the mass, polypus like, is separated and exhibits a life of its own. And so the affair goes on; and if we stood long hours to watch we should find over and over again a repetition of similar phenomena. Indeed, in the course of a quarter of an hour we may very likely see all that is to be seen. Occasionally, and perhaps frequently during the day, some one may be seen Bible in hand originating a counter movement of quite a different order. He is a preacher; very likely a plain man who hopes to do good by means of a sermon. With such, however, our business does not now lie. His action is but an episode in the drama which is proceeding, an accident which may or may not occur while we are spectators. It is true that he too is sometimes involved in the general movement, and losing his office as a mere field preacher, becomes whirled into the eddying circles which embody the characteristic elements.

It seems remarkable that an assemblage, subject to so much flux and reflux, should be so persistent; but the fact is, that it is mainly sustained by the accession of new ingredients. The most scorching sun cannot melt it, and nothing but a shower of rain can dissolve it; and that can, generally, in a few minutes. The whole phenomenon is certainly curious, and occurring as it does Sunday after Sunday, it is well worthy of attention. Let us then make our way to one of the smaller groups, and see first what it is made up of. We soon see that most of the persons are working men of all degrees of cleanliness and dirt, and from wretched rags to respectable habiliments. There is a sprinkling of persons who are of a better grade, and there may possibly be one or two who look like dissenting ministers or city missionaries. There are a certain number of boys, very likely a girl or two, and possibly a woman. In the centre of this group are two or more men engaged in lively discussion. One, two, three, or four may be speaking at once, or at least taking their part in the argument, if such it can be called. The chief speakers are, however, two, and with these is the tug of war. Their language is strong,

their manner rather excited as a rule, and they constantly interrupt each other. The listeners all feel at liberty to make remarks, and applause, or disapproval are freely expressed in unmistakeable terms. One of the leaders may have a book : it is so here, and that book is Cobbett's *Legacy to Parsons*. In an adjoining group there is no book ; in a third there is one, but it is the Bible ; the same book is in a fourth, but in none of the groups do we see it in the hands of each of the chief speakers. It may be different sometimes, but to-day the Bible is not conspicuous.

We return to the first group, and find the disciple of Cobbett speaking : "Your religion," he says, "damns a man for not believing what he cannot believe. Jesus Christ says that we should love our enemies, and yet he tells us he will say to his enemies, 'bring them forth and slay them before me.' He tells us that if we do not believe his words he will say to us, 'Depart ye cursed into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.' He says that if we do not believe his words we shall all likewise perish." He concludes his harangue with a general denunciation of the "parsons," with special reference to the bishops ; and with a sweeping condemnation of Christians as "hypocrites." Who is this man ? Outwardly his garb is mean and dusty ; his straggling and well-greased locks are partly covered by a "wide-a-wake ;" he has not shaved himself recently, and is manifestly one of the great "unwashed." He is, however, tall and well-proportioned ; and he is fluent in speech, but the sardonic smile, the malicious twinkle of his eye, and the ridicule which he throws into his tones, all shew the character of the man. He scorns and despises Christianity, and equally scorns its professors. It is plain that he takes a pleasure in debate ; that it is his Sunday amusement, and that he is less earnest in his search after truth than in his passion for a momentary advantage. Probably he speaks the truth, when in reply to a casual question from a bystander, he says, "I don't much like Jesus Christ." His opponent is a young man, respectably dressed, and from his tone and manner seems to be a Methodist preacher. Although clearly used to this sort of work, he is more slow and deliberate than the other, and at the same time less direct. But he is, we should think, more sincere and earnest ; he is certainly not reckless in his utterances. There is, however, nothing particularly pointed or powerful in his reply. He is hardly a man for home thrusts in the form of argument, but he is quite ready with practical, homiletic hints, which make some amends for it. The Bible is his authority, and he does not find any difficulty in quoting from it what he deems suffi-

cient to shew that his adversary had both misunderstood and misquoted it. We do not give his answer, but it led to a change of scene if we may so call it. The "Christian" as the people called him was interrupted by the unbeliever:—

"Heaven! where is heaven? what is heaven? what is the way to it?" This is followed by a short answer, amounting in part to a confession of ignorance; with the hint that the infidel might find the way to it, and the hope that he would believe to the saving of his soul. "The soul!" exclaimed the man with the unwashed face, "I should like to know what a soul is! What form is it? what colour is it? I never saw one, and I don't know anybody else who did." He was informed that the soul is that in a man which thinks, and will live for ever. "Live for ever will it?" he broke out again, "live for ever! How do you know that?" A short answer was followed by the question, "What do you think will become of the soul?" His reply was, that when he died he supposed the soul would die too. A moment's pause, and then he began, "Ah! now I have it. I can prove to you that the soul dies with the body. If you should go to Westminster Abbey to the grave of Macaulay, you would find his body, but you would not find his soul. Tell me how that is?"

Absurd as such a speech is, it is received with grunts of approval by more than one of the audience, and charity performs the task which dignity would refuse, and answers the question. "In the first place the soul is by its nature always invisible to men on earth, and therefore would not be seen if it slept with the body. In the second place the soul does not sleep with the dead body, but is gone to another state of existence."

We have had quite enough of the man with the wide-awake and greasy locks, and are turning to come away, when we encounter an apparition moving along and exclaiming:—"Heaven! what we want is a heaven below! We want a *millennium* here."

The said apparition was a slender and spectre-like form of a man, with sharp features, among which the nose was remarkably prominent, and a set of large and grimy teeth were very conspicuous. An overgrown hat, a seedy coat, a greasy vest, and dilapidated trousers, distinguished the man; but not much more so than a large dirty shawl-like neckerchief, which had in truth been carefully put on so as to conceal all evidence of the presence or absence of a clean shirt. Finally, the said apparition rejoined in a face and pair of hands which had long been strangers to ablution. His poverty-stricken and dirty state were such that we did not wonder much to hear some one of the crowd

tell him to "wash himself," and another, to "clean his teeth." From what we afterwards saw too, we found that the character of the man was to go in and out uttering what he considered ingenious ejaculations, and so to attract attention.<sup>4</sup>

We pass on. Here is another dense group crowding about two noticeable combatants. The "Christian" is a little man in a working dress, with a brown coat on his back and a cap on his head. He has a Bible in his hand, and his smiling face and the sparkling of his eye shews that he feels at home and happy, while stating his opinions with much readiness and confidence. There is a preaching element in his line of argument which is shewn by frequent appeals to the conscience of the other man. This other man is, we are sorry to see, another specimen of the unshaven and unwashed. He looks as if he had deteriorated, and he proves by his tone and manner that he is by no means undisciplined. He is fierce in his polemics, and has a very extensive acquaintance with the contents of the Bible, which he too holds in his hand. His cap is stuck rather jauntily upon his head, indicating a careless spirit notwithstanding his fierceness of manner. From inquiries we made we ascertained that he had once been a "professor," and had even been wont to "preach" upon the very ground where he now stood as an infidel. The question under dispute was the New Birth, but we do not propose to go over the cavillings to which we listened upon that subject. At one point there was a diversion in consequence of a reference to the commandments of God. "What are they? How do I know that God has given me any commandments?" asked the unbeliever. The reply was a simple reference to the Bible as containing God's commandments, and some quotations by way of example. It was with regret that we heard among the latter the words, "My son, give me thine heart;" for, however allowable it may be to use the words as a peg to hang a sermon upon, it is surely a mistake to call them a commandment of God in the sense intended. A reference to Proverbs xxiii. 24—26, will shew that our scruples are not without foundation.

After a certain amount of further skirmishing, the Christian begged to read Heb. vi. 4—6; which he did, the other man saying portions of the passage before him as he went along, to shew he knew it. The intention of the quotation was doubtless to warn the man who had once avowed himself a disciple, but now sought to destroy the faith he had then preached. It seemed to do no good, but rather to arouse him afresh; and he broke in with the declaration that he would let them know what the

---

<sup>4</sup> Since then the man has become habitually cleaner and better conducted.



"commentors" said about the text. He made his word good by saying that the Calvinists affirmed it did not apply to real Christians at all, but only to those who were outwardly such; that in fact it was only the Arminians who said it meant true Christians who had fallen away. Some confusion followed, so we went further to make new observations.

The next circle contained a man who was denouncing the luxury and wealth and pride of Christians, especially of the bishops and the clergy. His aim was plainly to create prejudice against Christianity by attacking its professors. One old man rushed in and vowed that all Christians were hypocrites. This led to a stern injunction from some one to be silent. The old man said he was but a poor water-cress seller, but he had a right to his opinion, and to speak; and away he went. Meanwhile, the chief speaker was reminded that Christianity was not answerable for the errors or even the excesses of its professors. "Pardon me," said he, and he said this after every observation addressed to him; "pardon me; Christianity is part of the law of this land." We marvelled what would come next; for the bearing of this upon the point he had raised did not appear. Well, he went on in a quiet but bitterly sarcastic tone, to declare that Christianity was a persecuting system, that it allowed all sorts of exactions, such as church-rates, and that by the statute-law of this land, a man who did not go to church could be sent to prison; that this law was, in fact, frequently enforced in country places where he had been. The clergy, he said, were the most tyrannical, and mentioned a case in which a Cornish clerical magistrate had sent to gaol, for sleeping in the open air, poor people who could afford no other lodgings.

The man from whom we heard all this, was respectably dressed, wore spectacles, and was browned by exposure to the sun and air. He is an old hand at this work, and is, if we mistake not, one L——, who used to dub himself the "English Voltaire." We once heard the said "English Voltaire" in a formal discussion, arguing for the blankest atheism. He wound up one of his most rhetorical speeches with this flagrant specimen of insincerity: "There is no God: your Bible itself declares there is none: 'There is no God; yea, I know not any.'" Yet he was not hissed down, nor expelled from the hall: on the contrary, his impudence was followed by thunders of applause. Not a few of the party—they are all seekers for the truth—are utterly indifferent to logic, honesty and consistency. He is the man for them who is brazen-faced or brazen-throated, and who can by any scheme gain a real or apparent advantage, and make a "good hit." Sincerity is not their virtue, and they look on

each other as gladiators, boxers, or actors, who have a certain part to play. One of the greatest problems in this matter, is how to deal with the moral obliquity and perverseness which characterize some of the party. We are convinced that not truth, but victory and flattery are what they desire most. Some, again, seem to have a love of contention for its own sake; and we know it to be a fact that they have remained for nine or ten hours at a stretch upon the ground, with the shortest possible interval for scanty refreshment.

Before leaving the gentleman who spake against the persecuting character of Christianity, we notice that a man close to us, with a straw hat on and a short blue jacket, proclaimed that it was quite true, for Paul himself declared, "I robbed other churches." This pitiable misconception of Paul's meaning was worthy of the place and the occasion. The deluded man who gave utterance to it is, we were told, a milkman, and has cows to take care of. It is high time for the shepherds to look after their flocks, when infidelity is tainting milkmen and water-cress sellers; and it is high time to think what can be done in behalf of those poor souls for whom Christ died, but who have thus been won over to the enemy. When infidelity gets into the cowshed and the backslums, it must not be left in quiet possession. The soul of the meanest is infinitely precious, and this should awaken us. But if not, we may remember that anti-Christian elements in the lowest strata of society may generate a hotbed of untold evil to the state. Not a few of the infidels or "secularists" are very regardless of personal appearance; and we may infer that the prevalence of their principles may lead to an increase of dirt, disease, wretchedness and vice, which would be very difficult to deal with. From what we have seen and heard, we suspect that the social aspects of the question are only second in gravity to its religious aspects. It was not without satisfaction that we heard Christian men, on the occasion which furnished our text, vigorously asserting the moral and social duties of religion—industry, honesty, sobriety, purity, and cleanliness. This last was declared to be next to Godliness, for a true Christian could not be dirty, even if he was poor; purity of body must characterize those who are pure in heart and soul.

The pictures are not all unrolled. Our next visit was to a group where the man we had first listened to had found a new congregation. This time he was initiating his audience in the mysteries of Biblical impurity. The Bible, he said, was an impure book, not fit for women and children, although he was sorry to say some of them found pleasure in reading its worst passages. He should give them a few examples. Beginning

with David, "the man after God's own heart," who caused the death of Uriah to obtain possession of Bath-Sheba; he next rehearsed the cases of Noah, Lot, Onan, etc. But the Book of Proverbs and Solomon supplied him most abundantly. He rehearsed in his own style—scandalously suppressing every denunciation of the sinfulness described—the descriptions of sins found in the Proverbs. He utterly ignored every avowed disapproval of sin, all condemnation of it, and all the illustrations of its punishment found in Scripture. He quoted as he liked, and what he liked, in a tone and manner which was revolting. Nay, he went further, and avowed that many Christians, and especially the clergy, carried out the licentious suggestions of the Bible.

What can be done with men of this sort? It is true they are a disgrace, a scandal, a nuisance, and the rest of it; but the fact is, they exist among us and lie in wait for the unwary. Like the women they love to talk about, they are "subtil of heart;" they are "loud and stubborn," and their feet abide not in their house; they are now without, now in the streets, and they speak with an impudent face. With their much fair speech they cause some to yield, and force them with the flattering of their lips. These follow them like oxen to the slaughter, and like fools to the correction of the stocks. This is the evil: What is the remedy? Shall we appeal to the strong arm of the law to suppress them, at least so far that they shall not ply their nefarious trade in public? They are real corruptors of youth, labouring to destroy the sentiments of religion and virtue, to uproot all the seeds of sound instruction, and eventually to ruin men's souls. Suppressed in public, all eye-sore would be removed, but it would find secret corners wherein to flaunt itself, and would be none the less evil, for the provocation caused by repressive measures. Meanwhile it is corrupting portions of the stream of our national life; and if we cannot eject it bodily, we must in self-defence endeavour to discover a disinfectant to neutralize its force, to nullify its action. Perhaps the great majority of us never saw this form of evil,—never even heard of it,—but if not, we soon may; we have but to turn aside, and a little enquiry will bring us into its presence. If we are loath to look on it in the open air, we can see it in certain halls for discussion, where ribald accusations against the Bible as encouraging and blessing immorality, are part of the unfailing stock in trade. Of course it will be said that those who resort to this kind of charge, teach and practice the most exalted virtue. Would that it were so. But it is by no means the case. We do not condemn all of living vicious lives; but we have reason to fear that it is not love

of moral excellence which commonly wings such arrows, so much as a desire to shew that the Bible teaches, and holy men practise, no better morality than the unbeliever. Thus the objection becomes practically a cloak for sin. Nothing but the grace of God can cure such shocking depravity; but since grace itself comes to men through suitable means, we are still infinitely concerned to know what are the best means of grace for such men. Our present object is not to awaken contempt, but pity, for them, and the spirit of help.

It follows, perhaps, from the very nature of these discussions, that there is no church or community which is generally attacked as such. The one thing supposed to be at stake is Christianity; and if this is assailed through its professors, it is not as Churchmen, not as Dissenters, not as Protestants, not as Roman Catholics. There is no invidious comparison of "sect with sect," and it would be difficult to ascertain the personal whereabouts of any one engaged in the *melée*. Of course these things may be inferred, or possibly ascertainable on inquiry; but what we mean is, that they do not usually come up for discussion. Mormon, Roman Catholic, Protestant, are words which we have certainly heard, but we have also heard it proclaimed—"Here we know no sects." Once, an enthusiastic and fiery little man broke out with the avowal that the New Testament did not teach "temperance" (he meant total abstinence from intoxicating drinks), and he began to quote the miracle at Cana, and Paul's advice to Timothy in proof, but he was very speedily put to silence. The man who thus appealed to the Christian Scriptures was, by the way, a very decided "secularist." We may not be wrong in viewing this absence of sectarian polemics as not an unfavourable feature in this out-of-doors controversy. It has not been always so everywhere; we have ourselves visited the "Vicar's Croft" at Leeds on a Sunday afternoon, and witnessed a very different spectacle,—a perfect Babel of party polemics; here a Mormon, there a Romanist; here a Methodist preacher, and there a secularist, and so forth. The name and opinions of M. Renan are known to some extent, and Bishop Colenso seems to be a household word. Luther is assailed, Calvin is assailed, Mr. Holyoake is discussed, "Iconoclast" is quoted, so is Robert Taylor, and even Paine is remembered, but the Bible is the plain of Jezreel, the theatre of contention.

Without rehearsing any more of the incidents of our first visit to the locality we have in view, we may say that, with a view to fuller information, we have gone to it again and again. On each occasion we have found some who appear to be always there either as spectators or as combatants, but we have also

noticed fresh faces on both sides every time. Once or twice we have been a little amused to hear a foiled antagonist beating a retreat by inviting his opponent to a certain "Hall of Science," as the place where perfect demonstration could be had. This "Hall of Science" is somewhere in the City Road, and is regarded as a kind of secularist cathedral, where the prophets and oracles of the system can be consulted. One of the gentlemen who generously volunteered an invitation to the cave of mysteries, went off with the announcement that he was a believer in "The Logic of Death," one of Mr. Holyoake's writings which has reached its forty-sixth thousand.

Another general fact which particularly struck us, during six or seven weeks, was the almost entire absence of discussion respecting prophecy and miracles. Once indeed the subject came forward in our hearing. A not very sanguine objector was stating his difficulties, when the question of evidences was brought in. The prophecies of the Old Testament and of Christ were appealed to as arguments for faith; especially the actual condition of certain places mentioned in the prophecies, was compared with the terms of those prophecies. Volney was immediately quoted by the objector as supplying facts of that sort; but he maintained that since places not mentioned by the prophets had also been destroyed, the argument had no force. Macaulay would be no prophet even if his famous New Zealander should come and gaze on the ruins of London. "Do you," said he, "expect me to regard Christ as a prophet?" An affirmative reply evoked the observation, "You might as well expect me to believe the legerdemain of the loaves and fishes." This led to a discussion about miracles in general, and that in particular. The man was evidently afraid to declare Christ an impostor, but he steadily affirmed his disbelief of the miracles, and that even if they could be proved, they would not convince him that he must accept Christianity. A little further observation shewed us that this man's creed was that, although Christianity was what he called "the best religion out," no man was bound to adopt any religion at all.

A deeper enquiry was started by another, who objected to the idea of a Creator and a creation. He did not say there was no God, he could not tell; but he was quite sure all that existed either had always existed as it is, or has been developed by the power of nature. Geological facts appeared to have influenced him, and once he asked his competitor if he had read Sir Charles Lyell on the *Antiquity of Man*. We did not stop to hear this debate to its close, but we could not help thinking of the march of the age, when working men are laying hold somehow or other

of our higher literature. Another individual supported his position by the assertion, that nearly all men of science were unbelievers, and he too cited Sir Charles Lyell as an illustration. On the other side we heard the names of Dr. Pye Smith, Dr. Hitchcock, etc. Surely the printing press is doing wonders; whether for evil or for good.

Take another example of the way in which knowledge of books leaks out at these places. A young man was urging various difficulties, and among others this,—that we have not the whole of the Bible even in its original languages. The *proof* was, that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in a Hebrew dialect and not in Greek: the *inference* was, that not having the original, but only a translation, we have no proof as to what St. Matthew actually wrote! The only error in the man's statement was that the Hebrew origin of the first Gospel was a demonstrated fact; of his inference we need say nothing.

There was another young man, whose doctrine was that the Bible is substantially true, but that it abounds in incidental corruptions and interpolations. He has made up his mind that whatever seems to be objectionable in Scripture—that is, seems objectionable to him—is a later addition by those who wished to make it wonderful.

In one group we found rather a conversation than a discussion proceeding upon the question of what may be called natural beliefs. Somebody had said he had his doubts in regard to a creation and a Creator; and this led to the endeavour to shew that all nations had some idea of a supreme Being, some form of worship, and some notion that the world had a beginning. It was also affirmed that few or none had been without the theory of a future state of retribution. We heard mention even of the transmigration of souls among the Egyptians and the Buddhists. At another time we heard it said that in somebody's opinion,\* the incarnation of Christ was invented or imitated from the incarnation of Vishnu in Krishna. It is to be hoped that the holders of this monstrous opinion will be careful to be silent as to the terrific obscenities of the Krishna story, and of the modern horrors of Krishna worship as exemplified in Juggernaut.

The Saviour's incarnation is a difficulty which we have heard actually discussed, but we are sorry to say the objector did not treat the subject with common delicacy. This is one of the great evils of the business, and yet one that we might look for. How can we expect those who have no reverence for anything,

---

\* The reference was most likely to Robert Taylor.

to deal properly with a certain class of questions? The love of obscenity is often scarcely disguised, and when this is coupled with all the bitterness of sarcasm and ridicule, it is easy to guess what will be the style of the language employed. We found one of these gentry, to give a mild illustration, expatiating on the conduct of Abraham in denying his wife before Pharaoh and Abimelech; so at least he called it. This man said little that was positively indecent, but he insinuated a good deal. In this case, however, the respondent, whom we took to be a clergyman, was too gentlemanly and dignified in his bearing to be trifled with, and we must say that the objector cut a very poor figure. No sooner, however, was the Christian out of the way, than the secular disputant returned to the charge with rather more assurance, but with not much better success.

One of the subjects most violently argued, and most frequently, was the future condemnation of the wicked to eternal punishment. It seems to be thought unrighteous, that men should suffer hereafter for not being what they could not be. The idea is, that if a man cannot believe the Gospel, but yet lives honestly and soberly, he *ought* to be admitted to heaven. The severity of Christ's requirements was on more than one occasion objected to, in such a way as to illustrate the grossly literal principle of interpretation adopted by this school. With them, "cut off your right hand," or "pluck out your right eye," "take no thought for the morrow," and much more in that style, is to be taken exactly as it stands. Hence Christ is accused of teaching his disciples to "hate" their nearest relatives. To say that he also teaches honour to parents, and love and kindness to all men, is merely to bring down the new accusation that his teaching abounded in contradictions. Hence it is apparent that a very hard task lies before those who would treat the subject of religion apologetically, and in view of the classes where this sort of unbelief is most prevalent. Not only are there the blunted and distorted moral faculties, which are all the more difficult to reach that early training and experience have been what they are; but there is an ignorance of the laws of thought, of evidence, and of language, which is more difficult to deal with than the mere ignorance of facts. The ignorance and the moral obliquity often in a manner coalesce, and the result is, that the man in whom this takes place hardens his heart and blinds his eyes at the same time. It was not without cause that one of these, rather frankly, rehearsed in our hearing the couplet,—

"A man convinced against his will  
Is of the same opinion still,"

Such persons not only do not wish to be convinced; there is nothing they so much fear. We saw one who was boasting of the "lamb-like" deaths of some infidels he had known. He was reminded that this proved nothing, because the men might have been equally beyond feeling and reflection: that besides, it often had happened that men who had lived infidels could not die such, of which a bystander supplied examples from his own observation. The man in reply declared that all such death-bed repentances were proofs of cowardice. This led to the observation that it was conscience which made cowards of them, that they were indeed afraid to take that awful leap in the dark, and that they at least felt that infidelity left them without hope on their death-bed. Other remarks of a somewhat pointed character, in the form of an appeal to the conscience of the man, were added, and we were surprised at their effect. He was evidently confused, and having no more to say, beat a retreat at once from unwelcome anticipations and from the discussion.

It would seem as if some of these persons can argue and debate and cavil to any extent, but are unable to bear the consideration of the tremendous responsibilities they incur. To avoid this they will strain every nerve, and they are never so distressed as when a calm and earnest adversary grapples with their conscience. For the truth is, that most of them exhibit traces of conscience when they are dealt with in this way. The difficulty is to get upon this ground; but their resistance and their perplexity when it is secured, manifestly prove its importance. Hence we gather that moral considerations are more weighty than merely intellectual ones; that, in fact, the two must, whenever possible, be united.

The subject of prayer, its use and efficacy, is a favourite one. It is assumed that, according to the New Testament, Christians are promised whatever they pray for; and scenes in a certain sense ludicrous are the consequence. For example, more than once we have seen this.—The secularist asks the Christian if he believes in the duty and efficacy of prayer, and is naturally answered in the affirmative. After a little cavilling the secularist says, "Now, then, you believe nothing of the sort, or if you do, you are deluded. If you really believe this you ought to go down upon your knees and pray for my conversion. Kneel down here, sir, and pray for my conversion. If you do this, and I am not converted, it will prove your doctrine is false; but if you refuse to do this, it will shew that you do not believe the Scriptures yourself, nor believe what you say." Of course no sensible man would be disconcerted by a dilemma of this sort;



but what of those who are not sensible, or are deeply prejudiced?

Faith, again, is drawn into controversy in this way: "Christ says that if you have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, you shall say to this mountain, 'Be thou removed, and be thou cast into the sea,' and it shall be done. We want a proof of this. We want you to say to this or that object, 'Be thou removed,' and we want to see it remove." Such language reveals an utter lack of discrimination between the literal and the figurative, and also between the special and the general. If Christ's words refer to miracles at all, they can in that sense only apply to an age of miracles, and those to whom miraculous powers were restricted. If they are meant to illustrate the efficacy of genuine faith, they are figurative, and must bear a moral construction. We have heard other texts quoted, or misquoted, with a similarly erroneous application. Thus we found a man saying, "These signs shall follow *all* them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents," etc. The interpolation of the word *all* supplies a basis for a reply. This is not a promise to all, but it forms part of what our Lord said to the *Apostles* when he was giving them their final instructions. To them, therefore, the words specially apply; but not to them only, for miracles were wrought by others: yet they do not apply to all even in the apostolic age, and certainly not in ours. Faith is satisfied if they have ever been fulfilled; and sees in the extent of their fulfilment the clue to their real meaning. Whether they have also a moral significance is quite another question.

The misquotation of the passage last referred to, recalls to our recollection another. One of these accomplished disputants did not believe in a heaven; but if there is one, he thought he had a chance, for Peter holds the keys. How did he know that? why Christ said to him, "I will give unto thee the keys of heaven." Nothing of the kind; the words are, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and there is the widest difference between "heaven" and the "kingdom of heaven." How so? He does not see it. He will admit, however, that the "kingdom of God" often means the same, and it will be easy to remind him that Christ said, "The kingdom of God is within you," and to refresh his memory with other texts bearing upon the same point. An opportunity will then be afforded for the introduction of one or two moral considerations.

Once an amusing attempt was made in our presence to improve upon the moral system of our Lord. "He certainly had said, 'Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you,

do ye also unto them,' but a higher and better maxim was, 'Do ye that which is right, whether men do so to you or not.' Thus the principle of disinterested virtue was paraded as a virtue unknown to the moral system of Jesus, and superior to it.

\* \* \* \* \*

The reader will probably have had enough. He should, however, be informed that the preceding notes, so far as they assume the shape of a record, were written six months ago. After that time, especially, the writer almost every Sunday spent several hours upon the ground till the "close of the season," and endeavoured to exercise a personal influence upon the contentions carried on. During that period some of those referred to in the foregoing account withdrew, others became silent, others became improved in personal appearance and manners, and some modified their views and language very decidedly. Yet the sketch must stand as drawn from the life, and as substantially true to the last. We have notes of nearly all the objections subsequently advanced, and on looking over them, think the above a fair specimen so far as it goes, though not including examples of every class.



*Infidelity.*—There are certain men who, calling themselves wise men, pretend to have discovered the imposture of our most holy faith. The Bible, with them, is mere fiction, and the tendency of its belief, to wreathe the yoke of ignorance and superstition around the necks of their fellow-men. With a generosity quite worthy of their cause, they propose to emancipate us from our debasing thralldom! From what thralldom? From the thralldom of that faith which works by love, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world? from the thralldom of that holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord? from the thralldom of that peace of God, which passeth understanding? from the thralldom of a hope of immortality that maketh not ashamed? from the thralldom of a joy unspeakable, and full of glory? From such a thralldom do we wish to be at liberty? No; we are determined, by the grace of God, to glory in the cross of Christ, and to rejoice in his service as the most honourable freedom. Infidelity, like the bird of night, seldom ventures abroad in the full splendour of day, but chooses rather to pursue its course among its native shades. When going forth, as it often does, under covert of the clouds of night; or when, on some occasions, assuming a bolder attitude of defiance to the truth, we need narrowly to watch its movements, and to beware of those who, prompted by the pride of their heart, bid us join with them in despising the religion of the Bible. In viewing this book as the repository of the faith once delivered to the saints, "we have not followed a cunningly devised fable," but are cherishing a devout regard to "a sure word of prophecy, to which we do well to take heed, as unto a light shining in a dark place."—*Pringle.*

## EXEGESIS OF DIFFICULT TEXTS.

## MATT. xxvi. 50.

THE MSS. here vary between ἐφ' ᾧ and ἐφ' ὃ πάρει. It will perhaps be remembered that we shewed in our July number for 1863 (p. 314), that there is no occasion whatever for treating the relative as an interrogative, an explanation which we doubt not will ere long be generally accepted, as it has been already by Mr. Webster in his *Syntax and Synonyms of the New Testament*. But our present purpose is rather to illustrate the variation of the reading. We find a precisely similar variation in the *Orestes* of Euripides, line 1345. Aldus and most of the MSS. read:

“σώθηθ' ὅσον γε τοῦτ' ἐμοί· ᾧ κατὰ στέγας, κ.τ.λ.”

Porson and subsequent editors read:

“σώθηθ', ὅσον γε τοῦτ' ἔμ'· ᾧ κατὰ στέγας, κ.τ.λ.”

Porson, intending to shew how closely synonymous the two expressions τὸ ἐπ' ἐμοί and τὸ ἐπ' ἐμὲ are, concludes his note on the passage of Euripides as follows: “Totus vero Prisciani locus ita legendus est: Ξενοφῶν παιδείας V. (4, 11.) καὶ νῦν τὸ μὲν ἐπ' ἐμοί οἴχομαι, τὸ δ' ἐπὶ σοὶ σέσωσμαι. *Λυσίας* ad accusativum κατ' Ἀγοράτου ἐνδείξεως, Καὶ τότε ἐπ' ἐκείνον ἐσώθης.”

Τὸ ἐπ' ἐμοί properly means “that which stands upon me as a basis,” hence, “as far as on me lies,” and thus “as far as I am concerned.” Τὸ ἐπ' ἐμὲ means “that which extends up to and over me,” hence, “as far as reaches and affects me,” “as far as I am concerned.”

## MATT. xxvii. 42. MARK xv. 31.

The Authorized Version, and all the texts that we have consulted, punctuate this passage without a note of interrogation. “He saved others, himself he cannot save.” Tischendorf punctuates Mark xv. 31, 32, so as to give the construction: “The Christ the King of Israel saved others, himself he cannot save; let him now come down,” etc. To our mind there is much greater force and connection in the words, if οὐ be taken interrogatively=*nonne*? In Matthew, rejecting the εἰ, we shall thus have: “Others he saved, himself can he not save? He is the King of Israel, let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe [in] him.” In Mark: “Others he saved, himself can he not save? Let the Christ, the King of Israel, come down now from the cross, that we may see and believe.” It seems absurd to say that a person cannot save himself, and then to assume

his saving himself or its equivalent, coming down from the cross, as the condition of belief and acceptance. But if the question, "Can he not save himself?" be first raised, although it be by an ironical implication (*οὐ* interrogative expecting an affirmative answer), that of course he could, it follows naturally to make his possibly doing so the condition of belief and acceptance. However wicked we may judge the Jewish leaders to have been, we have no right to palm off illogical statements upon them, unless we are perfectly certain that they made them. And in the present instance a note of interrogation provides an easy escape from the difficulty, which is not altogether undeserving of regard, though De Wette simply passes it over by saying, that the passage goes best without a note of interrogation, and Bengel and Alford do not even notice it.

#### MARK vi. 7.

There is a peculiarity in the wording of this verse, which appears to have escaped the notice of commentators, who have consequently not drawn from it an inference very favourable to the exact and graphic nature of St. Mark's narrative. It runs: "And he summons to him the twelve, and began (*ἤρξατο*, aorist) to send them off two and two, and gave them (*έδίδου*, imperfect) authority over the unclean spirits." Here the change of tense to the imperfect would indicate that they were not all sent at once, but that, as each pair was sent, a separate gift of authority was conferred. A hint to a similar effect is given by the word *ἤρξατο*, "began," which certainly ought not to be translated "proceeded to send."

#### ACTS ii. 1.

Some little difficulty has been raised amongst commentators as to the exact meaning of the word *συμπληροῦσθαι* in this verse, which is translated in the Authorized Version, "When the day of Pentecost was fully come." There is no doubt that a past tense, like "was fully come," is an inadequate representative of the present *συμπληροῦσθαι*. Neither does "was completing itself," *i.e.*, "was passing on," "verlief," as De Wette has it, succeed in giving the force of the compound *συμπληροῦσθαι*, although it might do well enough for the simple *πληροῦσθαι*.

If we refer to the other two passages, in which the word occurs in the New Testament, we shall find a slightly different turn given to it. In Luke viii. 23, we have the word used without any reference to time. "And a storm of wind descended into the lake, and they were quite filling (*συνεπληροῦντο*), and were in danger;" where the preposition *σύν* appears to

indicate, that a complete and not a partial filling of the boat with water was threatening the disciples.

In Luke ix. 51 we have the word used with reference to time, as in the passage under consideration. "And it came to pass when the days of his reception [into heaven] were approaching completion (*συμπληροῦσθαι*), that he set his face to go to Jerusalem." It is pretty plain that the "days of his reception" mean the fixed time which was to elapse before, and end with, his reception into heaven, and that *συμπληροῦσθαι* indicates that a considerable portion of that time had already elapsed, and its end was approaching.

If we apply these considerations to the time of the day of Pentecost, when the Holy Spirit was given to the disciples, we shall find it impossible to explain the word *συμπληροῦσθαι* satisfactorily with reference to our own ordinary ideas of the beginning and end of days. When some people in mockery accused the disciples of being "full of sweet wine," St. Peter replied to the charge by observing, that it was but the third hour of the day, a time at which no one would be likely to be guilty of any such thing. This fixes the time of the descent of the Holy Spirit to the third hour, which was often used to include the whole time from its commencement to the sixth hour, or to a time immediately preceding it. This would be a little before or a little after nine o'clock in the morning, according to our reckoning of days, and the word *συμπληροῦσθαι* would be utterly inapplicable to it.

But if we consider, that the Jewish days began and ended with sunset, we cannot fail to observe that the third hour, or nine o'clock in the morning, would carry Jews through more than half the day. We should doubt very much whether the word *συμπληροῦσθαι* could be applied to a period of time, that was not at least half over, so that only the smaller portion still remained to be accomplished. Thus, assuming sunset to take place and the day to begin and end at eight o'clock in the evening, the expression *ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς* would naturally indicate some point of time subsequent to eight o'clock in the morning, when the Jewish day would be already more than half over. We doubt whether we can so easily furnish a translation as an explanation of the remarkable word *συμπληροῦσθαι*, but we feel confident, that our explanation is not far from the truth.

In Tacitus, *Hist.*, i., 48, we find the similar word "exple" used in a somewhat similar way. Tacitus says: "*Piso unum et tricesimum ætatis suæ annum explebat, fama meliore quam fortuna;*" meaning apparently, that Piso had almost completed

his one and thirtieth year. The passages on which Walther relies for his explanation of *explebat* as=*expleverat*, do not bear him out in that explanation. He explains every one of them correctly by itself, but not one of them is *in eodem genere* with *explebat* in Tac., *Hist.*, i., 48, and iii. 86.

Again in Acts vii. 23, we find *ὡς ἐπληροῦτο τεσσαρακονταετῆς χρόνος* used of Moses' approach to maturity, which is expressed in the LXX. by *μέγας γενόμενος*. The period of forty years is in this case traditional, and probably only approximate, so that the imperfect tense *ἐπληροῦτο* is properly used: "When a period of forty years was approaching completion." Where there is distinct Scriptural authority for the space of forty years, we find the aorist, as in Acts vii. 30, *καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσαράκοντα, ὤφθη αὐτῷ, κ.τ.λ.*, "And when forty years were completed, there appeared to him," etc.

#### ACTS iv. 13.

We cannot pass over in silence an error of Dean Alford's on this passage, which we hope he will remedy in a future edition. We consider him the father of Greek Testament criticism in this country, and should be only too glad to see his edition make a nearer approach to perfection than it has hitherto done. His note on this passage runs: "*καταλαβόμενοι*, 'having had previous knowledge;' not as E. V., which would be the partic. pres.; see the past, chap. xxv. 25." The English Authorized Version runs: "Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and *perceived* that they were unlearned and ignorant men. they marvelled." On this we should rather have observed, that "when they saw" is scarcely a proper translation of the present participle *θεωροῦντες*, whereas "when they perceived" exactly gives the force of the aorist *καταλαβόμενοι*, although "to perceive" is perhaps not always the best word possible for representing *καταλαμβάνεσθαι*. But we may fairly challenge Dean Alford to produce a single passage from any author, sacred or profane, in which either *καταλαμβάνειν* or *καταλαμβάνεσθαι* possesses the meaning "to have previous knowledge." In Acts x. 34, Peter uses *καταλαμβάνομαι* to exclude the possession of previous knowledge, and to express the present acquisition of knowledge: "In truth I apprehend, learn, or perceive, that God is not a respecter of persons." In Acts xxv. 25, Dean Alford does not attempt to upset the Authorized Version, although he refers us thither in his note on the passage under consideration, but tacitly acquiesces in "But when I *found* that he had committed nothing worthy of death." The active *κατέλαβεν* is used in John i. 6, where not many will be found

to object to the translation: "And the light shineth in the darkness, and the darkness apprehended it not." When *καταλαμβάνεσθαι* refers to knowledge at all, it uniformly indicates the acquisition of knowledge or intelligence not previously possessed.

#### Acts iv. 26.

The right reading, supported by the Alexandrian, Vatican, and Sinai MSS., appears to be *ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Βαρνάβας ἀπὸ* (not *ὑπὸ*) *τῶν ἀποστόλων*. We cannot forbear remarking, that the frequent use of *ἀπὸ* instead of *ὑπὸ* in similar collocations appears to us to be a simple Latinism, originating with the use of *a* or *ab* with the agent after passive verbs. No recondite explanation of Matt. xi. 19 and Luke vii. 35, *ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς*, has ever satisfied us. The key to the meaning appears to be in Luke vii. 29, *Καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας, καὶ οἱ τελῶναι, ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν Θεόν*, "All the people on hearing and the tax-gatherers justified God," *i. e.*, acted as if they were satisfied with His mode of proceeding, and thought it right. They were the children of wisdom, by whom she "was justified," *i. e.*, treated as if she had acted rightly. Latinism does not seem to have had its fair weight with commentators.

#### Acts iv. 29, 30.

These verses are usually construed so as to make *ἐν τῷ τῇν χεῖρά σου ἐκτείνειν σὲ εἰς ἱάσιν*, almost parenthetical, and consider *καὶ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἁγίου παιδῶ σου Ἰησοῦ* dependent upon *δοῦς* in the preceding verse. It is surely more natural to consider the whole of verse 30 as ruled by *ἐν τῷ*, and to translate, "And now, Lord, look upon their threats, and grant to thy servants with all boldness to speak thy word, while thou stretchest forth thy hand for healing, and signs and wonders take place through the name of thy holy servant Jesus."

#### Acts v. 3.

*Ψεύσασθαι τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον* is here translated by the Authorized Version "to lie to the Holy Ghost," and the margin proposes the substitution of "to deceive." *ψεύδομαι*, in the sense of "to lie," invariably takes a dative of the person to whom the lie is told, and *ψεύδω* is, as regularly, "to deceive." Why then was not *ψεύσαι* used instead of *ψεύσασθαι* by the writer of the Acts? Because *ψεύσαι* would have implied that the deception was complete, and that the Holy Spirit had been deceived, which would have been untrue. The present tense *ψεύδεις*, "to be deceiving," might possibly have been used of an incomplete and ineffectual deception, but the writer wished to

imply at once that the act was past and the deception incomplete. He therefore used the aorist of the middle, *ψεύσασθαι*, "to put a deception on." "Why did Satan fill thy heart, that thou shouldst put a deception on the Holy Spirit? . . . Thou didst not lie (*ψεύδομαι* with dative, its usual sense) to man, but to God." The use of the same word in the *Troades* of Euripides, line 1181, admits of a similar explanation. Hecuba says to Astyanax—

*ἐψεύσω μ', ὅτ' ἐσπίπτων πέπλους,  
ὦ μήτερ, ἡύδας, κ.τ.λ.*

"You put a deception on me, when running into my garments, you said, Mother, I will do so and so."

It will, however, be more satisfactory if we support our view of the difference between *ψεύσαι* and *ψεύσασθαι* by a quotation from Dr. Donaldson's *Grammar*, p. 436, "The appropriative middle has several particular applications. The middle verb often expresses a mental act or operation. Thus *ὀρίζω* means 'I define, mark out, or appoint something for another person,' as Eurip., *Iph.*, T. 979: *ἡμῖν ὀρίσεν σωτηρίαν* '[God] has appointed safety for us;' but *ὀρίζεσθαι* in the middle, besides its strictly appropriative sense, 'I mark out or appoint for myself,' 'I claim' (as in *Æsch.*, *Suppl.*, 256) means 'I estimate, define, or settle in my own mind,' as Arist., *Pol.*, v. 9: *κακῶς ὀρίζονται τὸ ἐλεύθερον*: 'they make a faulty estimate of freedom.' Similarly *ἀριθμεῖν* is 'to count or reckon,' but *ἀριθμεῖσθαι* is 'to reckon in one's mind,' (Plat., *Phædr.*, p. 270 D.): *σταθμᾶν*, 'to measure an object,' (Eurip., *Ion.*, 1137;) but *σταθμᾶσθαι*, 'to calculate in one's mind,' (Herod., ii., 150;) *διοικεῖν* is 'to manage or regulate externally,' as *διοικεῖν τὴν πόλιν* (Thucyd., viii., 21), but *διοικεῖσθαι* is 'to arrange a thing in one's own mind.' *Ex animi suâ sententiâ aliquid gerere constituere, præsertim machinari*, as Dem., *Phil.*, p. 93, 8, *πάνθ' ὅσα βούλεται Φίλιππος διοικῆσεται*."

Upon these principles *ψεύσαι*, the active, would mean "to deceive another person;" *ψεύσασθαι*, the middle, "to deceive another in one's own mind," "to put a deception upon him," whether that deception were effectual or not.

#### ACTS vii. 53.

Some light may be thrown upon the use of *εἰς* in the difficult passage, *οἷτως ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων*, by Thucydides, vii., 15, *ὅ τι δὲ μέλλετε, ἅμα τῷ ἡρὶ εὐθὺς καὶ μὴ ἐς ἀναβολὰς πράσσετε*, "But what you intend to do, do immediately with the spring, and without delays." Dr. Arnold's note



on this runs: "Compare Herodotus, viii., 21, οὐκέτι ἐς ἀναβολὰς ἐποιοῦντο τὴν ἀποχώρησιν; and ii., 121, οὐκ ἐς μακρὴν ἔργον ἔχεσθαι. In all these cases the preposition refers properly to some word understood, such as τρεπόμενοι, as in the well known expression, ἐς ἄλκην τρέπεσθαι. And thus in Thucydides, iii., 108, μήτε ἐς ἄλκην ὑπομεῖναι; the expression, if written at length, would probably have been, ἐς ἄλκην τραπομένους ὑπομεῖναι." But in the decline of a language the origin of such compound expressions is frequently lost sight of, and only their adverbial force remains. "Who received the law at injunctions of angels," is probably as exact and literal a version as the English admits of. Dean Alford of course refers to Matt. xii. 41, μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, "repented at the preaching of Jonah:" to which we would add, Heb. vi. 6, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν [τὴν διαθήκην] εἰς μετάνοιαν, "to renew again [their covenant] on repentance."

#### ROMANS ii. 27.

There is no doubt a certain amount of ambiguity in this passage, which according to the ordinary rules of the best grammars, *e.g.*, that of Dr. Donaldson, must be translated, "And shall not uncircumcision, which is by nature, if it fulfil the law, judge thee, who with the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?" where τελοῦσα is taken as a secondary predicate to ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία. This is certainly a clumsy construction, and Professor Jowett offers us an alternative in, "And shall not the uncircumcision, which by nature fulfils the law, judge thee, who by the letter and circumcision dost transgress the law?" where ἡ ἐκ φύσεως τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα is the epithet of ἀκροβυστία. We are inclined to agree with the alternative presented by Professor Jowett, but we should have gladly found him enunciating or explaining the principle upon which τελοῦσα is taken as part of the epithet, instead of being considered as a secondary predicate. Dr. Donaldson in his *Greek Grammar* has cited several similar passages, and endeavoured, as we think, without success to bring them under the laws of the secondary predicate. We will first enunciate the principle upon which we propose to justify Professor Jowett's alternative, and then go through Dr. Donaldson's passages *seriatim*, shewing how easily it is applicable to, and explains them all.

It is undoubtedly true, as a general rule, that words in agreement with a substantive placed between the article and that substantive are regularly its epithets or parts of its epithet, while similar words placed elsewhere are secondary predicates. But when there is a compound epithet, sometimes a part

only of the epithet is placed between the article and the substantive, and the rest, for euphonic reasons, is allowed to stand elsewhere. Thus, instead of writing ἡ ἐκ φύσεως τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα ἀκροβυστία, St. Paul has for euphonic reason written ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα, whence an ambiguity arises as to the construction, although the general sense is not materially affected.

If we take Dr. Donaldson's passages, we shall find that it is only owing to the unbending nature of his otherwise most correct theory of the secondary predicate, that (*Gr. Gram.*, p. 370) "the participle at the end causes the greatest difficulty, and can hardly be explained without supposing that the noun which precedes the participle is not only an apposition, but affects by a sort of attraction the gender of the article." In Thucydides, i., 11, δηλοῦνται τοῖς ἔργοις ὑποδέεστερα ὄντα τῆς φήμης καὶ τοῦ νῦν περὶ αὐτῶν διὰ τοὺς ποιητὰς λόγου κατεσχηκός, it is surely plain that the strictly proper place of κατεσχηκός is immediately before λόγου, and that for euphonic reasons Thucydides has put it out of its proper place. No ambiguity can here arise, because νῦν, which is manifestly closely connected with κατεσχηκός, is placed between the article and its noun, and determines the grammatical construction of κατεσχηκός as part of the epithet of λόγου. A similar remark will apply to ταχθεῖς, as determined by πρῶτος in ἦν δ' ὁ πρῶτος φόρος ταχθεῖς τετρακόσια τάλαντα καὶ ἑξήκοντα, Thucyd., i., 96; to καθεστῶτα determined by πᾶσι in Thucyd., iii., 56, § 1; αὐτοὺς ἐτιμωρησάμεθα κατὰ τὸν πᾶσι νόμον καθεστῶτα, and οὐσης determined by νῦν in Thucyd., v., 11, § 1; τὸν Βρασιδαν οἱ ξύμμαχοι ἔθαλψαν ἐν τῇ πόλει πρὸ τῆς νῦν ἀγορᾶς οὐσης. In Soph., *Philact.*, 1316 :—

ἀνθρώποισι τὰς μὲν ἐκ θεῶν  
τύχας δοθείσας ἐστ' ἀναγκαῖον φέρειν,

ἐκ θεῶν shews plainly that δοθείσας is part of the epithet of τύχας. Similarly, we conceive, that the construction of τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα is determined by ἐκ φύσεως in the passage of Romans under consideration, and that euphonic reasons, as we have already said, induced St. Paul to write ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα, instead of ἡ ἐκ φύσεως τὸν νόμων τελοῦσα ἀκροβυστία.

## 2 Cor. iv. 15.

The difficulties in this verse can scarcely be satisfactorily surmounted, unless recourse be had to the principle involved in the phenomena noticed in our July number, p. 275. We there endeavoured to shew, that in three passages the context

irresistibly leads the reader to understand οἱ πλείονες in the sense of οἱ τοσοῦτῳ πλείονες, the proportionately more. It matters little, whether we take περισσεύση transitively, and consider τὴν εὐχαριστίαν as its direct object, or whether we take it intransitively, and consider τὴν εὐχαριστίαν as its cognate or improper object. We would translate: "For all things (or all the things [above mentioned]) are for your sakes, that grace may multiply, and through proportionately more persons make thanksgiving abound (or abound with thanksgiving) to the glory of God."

Thucydides will also bear us out in this interpretation. In Thucyd., iv., 64, we find Hermocrates represented as saying, ἀξιώ . . . μὴ τοὺς ἐναντίους οὕτω κακῶς δρᾶν ὥστε αὐτοὺς τὰ πλείω βλάπτεσθαι, where he surely means to imply, "I think it proper not to injure my enemies in such a manner as myself to receive *proportionately* more (τὰ πλείω) injuries." Also in iv., 117, we have the words: Λακεδαιμόνιοι . . . τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἡγούμενοι . . . μᾶλλον ἐπιθυμήσειν αὐτοὺς . . . ξυναλλαγῆναι τε καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρας σφισιν ἀποδόντας σπονδὰς ποιήσασθαι καὶ ἐς τὸν πλείω χρόνον: "The Lacedæmonians, thinking that the Athenians would themselves be more eager both to be reconciled, and giving back the prisoners to them, to make a treaty also for a *proportionately* longer time," where it is much more natural to take τὸν πλείω χρόνον as equivalent to τὸν τοσοῦτῳ πλείω χρόνον, than, with Dr. Arnold, to oppose "*the* longer time generally stipulated by a treaty of peace to the brief interval of a mere truce." For we do not find any definite expression like ὁ μείων χρόνος to which mental reference can be made in the passage, whereas all is simple and easy under the principle which we are advocating.

#### 1 THESS. iv. 4.

It is useless to attempt to argue the grand question of the meaning of σκεῦος in this passage with any pretence of originality. Suffice it to say, that De Wette and others have abundantly proved that τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος can mean nothing but a man's own *wife*, or rather partner in the fulfilment of the great command, "Increase and multiply;" and that an excellent summary of the arguments to this effect is to be found in Bishop Ellicott's edition of this epistle. Still we cannot but remark on the curious tergiversation of Dr. Wordsworth, who appears to dislike this interpretation, and therefore endeavours to do violence to his somewhat rebellious scholarship. His words are: "With regard to the sense of *κτᾶσθαι*, *even if it be allowed that it must mean to ACQUIRE*, yet it includes the meaning of *keeping*,

as is evident from the boast of the Pharisee (Luke xviii. 12), ἀποδεκατῶ πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι." On referring to Dr. Wordsworth's own note on this passage, we find no doubt apparent as to whether it should or should not "be allowed that κτᾶσθαι must mean to *acquire*;" on the contrary, without any difficulty, he gives the unhesitating translation, "whatsoever I *ACQUIRE*." Evidently the Pharisee did not tithe his principal, but his acquisitions, whether in the form of a regular income or in that of the gains of trade.

It is absurd to pretend that a man is not in possession of his own body. He cannot be otherwise, unless he has had a paralytic stroke. How can he be said, κτᾶσθαι, to get possession of that which he already, κέκτηται, is in possession of? But it is argued that though he possesses it in one sense, he does not in another; that he possesses it by way of ownership, but not ἐν ἀγνώσυνῃ καὶ τιμῇ, as a Christian man ought to possess it; that he possesses it, in fact, by way of ownership, but it is not yet broken in, so as to be properly serviceable to him as a Christian. And κτᾶσθαι is assumed to indicate this gaining a mastery over or breaking in the body (Conybeare and Howson). It might as well be said, that, when a man acquires (κτᾶται) a horse by purchase, he does not fully possess it (κέκτηται), until it has been properly broken in, and, therefore, the word κτᾶσθαι must be taken to include the breaking in. To such shifts are those put, who reject the plain grammatical meaning of a word (κτᾶσθαι) (even allowing that σκεῦος is equivocal), simply because (*e. g.*, Conybeare and Howson, and even Vaughan), they do not like to find St. Paul using so coarse a term as σκεῦος of one standing in so holy a relation as that of wife. A similar feeling appears to have caused the mistranslation of ἀποκόγονται in Gal. v. 12 in the Authorized Version, contrary to the comments of the majority of the fathers.

A. H. W.

**METAPHYSICAL SCHOOLS AMONGST THE ARABS.<sup>a</sup>**

THE history of philosophy amongst the Arabs and the Jews is one of those subjects which have been, perhaps, least investigated, although it is of the highest importance in the annals of the intellectual progress of mankind. Whether we consider the followers of Mahomet as the representatives of a new religion, or as the brilliant commentators of Greek lore, they are equally entitled to our attention; their theories were deemed by the leading schoolmen worthy of serious refutation; treatises were composed in answer to their views of God and of nature; and, on the other hand, not a few amongst the teachers of the universities of Europe borrowed from them opinions and arguments. Now, the philosophy of the Arabs leads us necessarily to consider that of the Jews during the middle ages. Political events, wars, and conquests, brought both people into close contact with each other; their speculations had many features in common, and whilst reading the history of thought, as it manifested itself in the civilized world between the eleventh and the fourteenth centuries, we find Arab doctors lending to Jewish rabbis, and *vice versa* receiving from them the torch of learning. How the descendants of God's chosen people were moulded, intellectually speaking, by the circumstances amidst which they were placed during an important and lengthened epoch of the world's history, how their old schools became modified under the combined influences of Christianity, Persian theories and Mahometan speculations is surely a question well worthy of being accurately studied, and we shall, therefore, make no apology for introducing it to our readers.

The only obstacle to a review, such as the one we purpose undertaking here, would have been, until very lately, the absolute want of reliable information. Except the preface to Sale's translation of the Koran, and a few details given by Brucker—details which are often erroneous and mixed up with absurd and idle stories—the student was obliged to consult, on the subject of Arabic philosophy, books of rare occurrence and accessible only to those who are familiar with the languages of the East.<sup>b</sup> With respect to the Jews the difficulties were almost greater, and the tedious character of the works to be perused was enough of itself to deter the immense majority of inquirers. At present, however, the case is completely altered, and, thanks to M. Munk's

<sup>a</sup> *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*. Par S. Munk, Membre de l'Institut. 8vo. Paris: Franck.

<sup>b</sup> Schmölders' *Essai sur les Écoles Philosophiques chez les Arabes* (8vo, Paris, 1842), is a book very imperfectly done, and which must be consulted only with the greatest caution.

most erudite and interesting volume, no one need remain ignorant about a branch of metaphysical literature which equals in value and surpasses in importance, for us Christians, the philosophy of Greece and of Rome.

The high esteem in which M. Munk's *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe* are held on the continent, is proved by the fact that they have been translated into German and published in extenso by Dr. Beer;<sup>c</sup> Ritter in his history of philosophy has also borrowed largely from them, to say nothing of Messrs. Hauréau and Renan. When this last named gentleman was dismissed from his post as lecturer at the *Collège de France*, M. Munk received the appointment, and certainly no measure could be more cordially welcomed than that which placed the public teaching of Hebrew in the hands of so consummate a scholar. The *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe* consist of four parts. We have, in the first place, extracts from the *Fons Vite* of the philosopher Ibn-Gebirol who, under the name of Avicbron, enjoyed much reputation during the middle ages. A biographical sketch of the man himself then follows, together with an appreciation of his works and of his influence; finally, the third and fourth sections are taken up respectively by a survey of the history of metaphysics and of theology amongst the Arabs and amongst the Jews. It is these last two chapters that we would successively bring before the notice of our readers, and although we do not purpose giving, like Dr. Beer, a complete translation of M. Munk's *Mélanges*, most of the following details will be borrowed from that admirable volume.

The literary monuments of the Arabs do not occur beyond the sixth century of the Christian era; they never date their intellectual existence further back than the coming of their prophet, and they speak of the long series of ages that preceded him as of the *times of ignorance*. Simultaneously with the first appearance of Islamism, the enthusiasm which the new doctrines excited, and the fanaticism of the conquerors, left but very little time for reflection; but a century had scarcely elapsed when many independent minds began to reason upon the teaching which they had till then accepted as a matter of faith; and the opinions they promulgated, after leading in the first instance to religious schisms, became identified with a number of metaphysical schools.

The *Kadrites*,<sup>d</sup> or upholders of free will, and the *Djabarites*,

<sup>c</sup> *Philosophie und Philosophische Schriftsteller der Juden, eine Historische Skizze, aus dem Französischen, der S. Munk, etc.* Von Dr. B. Beer. 8vo. Leipzig. 1852.

<sup>d</sup> See Pococke, *Spec. Hist. Arab.*, p. 238.

or maintainers of fatalism, were the two primitive sects which originated with the interpretations put on the Koran by thinking Mahometans. Ma'bed-Ben Khâled al-Djonhi, who is generally considered the founder of the former, ascribed to the will of man alone the determination of his actions either good or bad. "Things," he said, "are entire;" that is to say, no predestination, no fatality influences the will of man. The fatalists, together with their leader Djahm ben Cafwan, might very well have been considered worthy of a place amongst the orthodox, had they not denied *in toto* the attributes of God. Their motive for so doing was, that according to them, the Deity should not be degraded by the ascription to it of the qualities belonging to mere creatures, and their system led necessarily to the representation of God as an abstract being deprived of all quality and all action. Against these errors the *Cifalites* protested, and falling into the opposite extreme, they maintained the grossest anthropomorphism. Finally, Wâcel ben-'Athâ,\* disciple of 'Hasan al-Ba'ri, of Bassora, having been expelled from the school as a *motazal* or dissenter, founded in his turn a new sect holding a middle position between the orthodox and the heretics, and professing a kind of rationalism leaning towards the doctrines of the *Kadrites*. The necessity on their part of defending themselves with the weapons of dialectics against their rivals, led the dissenters to attach great importance to *the science of the word* ('ilm al-calâm), meaning thereby, no doubt, the divine Word, the word *par excellence*. Those philosophers assumed the name of *Motecallemin*, and enjoyed an amount of authority which cannot be overrated.

From the above considerations it will be evident that when the Abassides ascended the throne of the Khalifs, the Arabs were thoroughly prepared to benefit by the leaven of philosophy which their intercourse with other countries would place within their reach. It has even been supposed that the development of the various schools we have just described may have received a great impulse from the contact of the followers of Mahomet with the Christians of Chaldea and of Syria who cultivated Greek literature; at all events, the generous and enlightened efforts of the Abassides, principally of the Khalif Al-Mamoun, brought under the notice of their subjects the literary riches of Greece; and although the practical tastes of the Arabs made them study more particularly the works relating to medicine, natural philosophy, and astronomy, yet the connection of these sciences with metaphysical speculations was so intimate, according to the

---

\* Born 80 Hegir. 699-700 A.D.; died 131 Hegir. 748-749 A.D.

views of the ancients, that from the curiosities of physical investigation the enquirers were by an easy transition led to discussions about God, the soul, and the problems of life.

The particular bent of the Arab intellect would likewise commend to that nation, amongst all philosophers, Aristotle rather than the less matter-of-fact Plato. Translations of the Stagyrte's works were made, M. Munk remarks, chiefly by learned Syrian or Chaldean Christians, living in the capacity of physicians at the court of the Khalifs, and who, thoroughly acquainted with Greek literature, recommended to their employers' notice the books which could interest them most. The treatises of Aristotle were translated for the most part from Syriac versions; for, as early as the reign of the emperor Justinian, Greek works had been rendered into that tongue, and thus the classical literature of the Hellenes had penetrated as far east as Chaldea and Palestine. Amongst the Syriac MSS. of the Paris Imperial Library we find a volume (No. 161) which contains Porphyry's *Isagoge*, and three books of Aristotle, viz., the Categories, the book on interpretation, and part of the first Analytics. The translation of the *Isagoge* is there ascribed to brother Athanasius, of the monastery of Beth-Malca, who finished it during the 956th year of the Seleucides, that is to say, A.D. 645. The version of the Categories is attributed to James of Edessa, who died A.D. 708. An Arabic codex which belongs to the early part of the eleventh century (No. 882) contains the whole of Aristotle's *Organon*, the rhetoric, the poetic, and also Porphyry's *Isagoge*. The authors engaged upon it were various; some of the tractates are described as rendered into Arabic from the Syriac, so that no doubt can possibly exist respecting the origin of these translations. Besides, the numerous interlinear and marginal notes which are added to the MS. prove that as early as the tenth century there were current several versions of Aristotle's works, and that the versions hastily made under the Khalifs, Al-Mamoun and Al-Motawackel, were subsequently revised, corrected from the Syriac or Greek texts, and even, in some cases, entirely recast. The codex we are now alluding to gives us *four* different translations of one single work. A mere glance at the critical apparatus exhibited by this precious MS., convinces us that the Arabs possessed versions made with the greatest care and the most scrupulous fidelity. Authors, therefore, who, without knowing anything about them, have called them barbarous and absurd were thoroughly mistaken, and must have formed their opinions

<sup>f</sup> Cf. the animadversions of Lud. Vivès, quoted by Brucker in his *Hist. Philos.*, vol. iii., pp. 106, 107. See also pp. 149, 150.



by examining imperfect Latin versions made not from the Arabic, but from Hebrew translations.

We shall not, for the present, enumerate the different Mahometan commentators or interpreters of Aristotle; the remarks we have to offer on that part of the subject will find their place most naturally when we treat under distinct sections of the leading Arabic philosophers. Suffice it to say here, that the enthusiasm which the Stagyræ's works excited was unbounded, and Ibn-Roschd, in particular, speaks of them in terms of the highest panegyric. It would be wrong to suppose on the part of the Arabs ignorance of the other metaphysicians of Greece; at an early period, as M. Munk observes, they had amongst their literary treasures the compilations of Neo-Platonist writers; but they never professed the doctrines of either Plato or Proclus, although these doctrines have evidently left traces of their influence in the theories of Mahometan thinkers.

The great problem for the Arabic metaphysicians who aimed at conciliating, as far as they could, Aristotle with the Koran, was to explain the dualism which results from the Greek philosopher's teaching, so as not to attack that strict belief in the unity of God which is the cardinal point of their religion. This, of course, was a matter of impossibility, and accordingly the speculative Arabs found themselves opposed most strenuously by the various sects, who from different points of view held more or less to the doctrines of the Koran. The greatest amongst the Arabic thinkers, Ibn-Roschd, Ibn-Sinâ, Al-Kendi, Al-Farâbi, were considered as guilty of irreligion; and, in order to meet the heterodox Aristotelicians on their own ground, the champions of orthodoxy applied themselves to the close study of dialectics. Hence, the new and important developments assumed by what is called the science of the *Calâm*. It had originally served, on theological ground, as a weapon wielded by the orthodox against the heterodox; now, in its extended form, it was applied by the followers of the Koran, whatever their minor differences, against the sectators of Hellenism. The *Motecallemîn*, or men of the Calâm, had for chief object to prove the existence of one God, Creator, eternal and spiritual; in order to do so with a force which might leave no room for objection, they borrowed from Democritus his atomic system,<sup>s</sup> and finally constructed a theory in which every principle of causality was destroyed, every relation between the things of this world, so that the Creator alone might be left. Under its primitive shape the

<sup>s</sup> M. Munk shews in his edition of Maimonides (*Guide des Égarés*, vol. i., p. 815, note 3), that there are some points of resemblance between the views of the *Motecallemîn* and those of Leibnitz.

doctrine of the Calâm had nothing exaggerated about it; on the contrary, it was, as we have already hinted, an attempt made to reconcile the opposite ways of interpreting the Koran. Al-Aschari, of Bassora (A.D. 880? — 940?) is the man who carried out to undue consequences the tenets of the *Motecallemin*; and his disciples, the *Ascharites*, although still endeavouring to reconcile the *Djabarites* with the *Cifatites*, broached on the subject of cause and accidents, opinions so utterly absurd that any refutation of them would be perfectly useless.

During the tenth century the Calâm had become extremely popular amongst the Arabs, and in consequence a kind of association was formed at Bassora amongst men of letters, who assumed the name of *brothers of purity* or of *sincerity*, and whose object it was to render more accessible to the multitude the combined teachings of religion and of philosophy. The union alone of Greek wisdom and of Islamism could, they said, produce some perfect system, and philosophy had for its mission the clearing away of the errors which in course of time had become mixed up with religious doctrines. In order to diffuse their ideas, the *brothers of purity* published a kind of cyclopædia consisting of fifty treatises, in which the various subjects were not thoroughly discussed, but only superficially examined, or at least dealt with from a popular point of view. This work can give a very correct idea of the studies with which the Arabs were at that time familiar. Condemned by the orthodox as impious, the *brothers of sincerity* met with scarcely a better reception from the philosophers properly so called.

Whilst the Ascharite Al-Gazali, leaning towards the mysticism of the Sufies, employed in the most masterly manner the weapons of scepticism in order to attack philosophy for the benefit of religion, the Arabic Peripateticians in their endeavour to explain the action of God upon matter, borrowed likewise from the arsenal of the Neo-Platonists; and, finally, a sect of contemplative philosophers, the *Ischrâkyîn*, adopting boldly mysticism in all its consequences, introduced a style of teaching which was according to all probability derived, in part at least, from the Hindus by the Persians, who in their turn transmitted it somewhat modified to the Arabs. In general we may say that philosophy amongst the Arabs instead of being exclusively a reproduction of peripatetism, went through all the evolutions which we find in the annals of Christian metaphysics. Dogmatism, scepticism, the theory of emanation, and even occasionally views analogous to Spinozism and modern Pantheism, all these peculiarities to a greater or less extent make up the whole *ensemble* of Arabic speculation.

The most celebrated philosophers amongst the Arabs, who flourished from the ninth century to the end of the eleventh, are Al-Kendi, Al-Farabi, Ibn-Sînâ, Al-Gazâlî, Ibn-Badja, Ibn-Tofail, and Ibn-Roschd. When we come to the thirteenth century, we find no longer pure Peripateticians, but only a few distinguished writers on religious philosophy, or rather a few *Motecallemin*, who reasoned on religion, discarding all pretensions to embody the true system of the ancient *Calâm*. One of the most eminent of these was Al-Idji (died in 1355), author of the *Kitdb Al-Mawdkif* (book of the stations), or *system of the Calâm*, which has been printed at Constantinople in 1824, with a commentary by Djordjâni.

The decay of metaphysical studies and especially of Peripatetism, must be ascribed to the influence which the sect of the *Ascharites* assumed during the twelfth century throughout the greater part of the Mussulman world. In Asia we find no distinguished Peripateticians posterior to Ibn-Sînâ. Under Çalâ'h-Eddîn (Saladin) and his successors, Ascharism spread itself over Egypt, and at the same epoch it flourished in the West, countenanced by the fanatic dynasty of the *Mowa'hhedin* or Al-Mohades. Most of the writings of Arabic philosophers were publicly burned or otherwise destroyed, and metaphysical speculation thus driven from the midst of the Mahometan populations, found a refuge amongst the Jews who translated into Hebrew Arabic works, or copied the Arabic texts in Hebrew characters. Thus it is that the principal writings of the Arabs have been handed down to us, especially those of Ibn-Roschd. Al-Gazâlî himself could not find grace for his compositions of a strictly philosophical character, which are known to us only through the medium of a Hebrew version. From this circumstance it follows that a thorough acquaintance with Rabbinical language is indispensable to those who would seriously study the philosophy of the Arabs. Ibn-Tibbon, Levi ben-Gerson, Kalonymos ben-Kalonymos, Moses of Narbonne, and a number of other translators and commentators, may be regarded as the continuators of the Arabic philosophers. It is by the versions of Jewish rabbis, translated into Latin, that the works of the Arabs, and even to a great extent the writings of Aristotle, came to the knowledge of scholastic doctors. The emperor Frederic II. encouraged the labours of the Jews; thus, at the end of his translation of the commentary of Ibn-Roschd on the *Organon*, commentary which was finished in 1232, Ben-Antoli, who lived at Naples, says that he had a pension from the emperor, who, he adds, loves science and those engaged upon it.

The works of the Arabic metaphysicians, and the manner in

which the books of Aristotle were introduced first to the Christian world, exercised a decisive influence upon the character which scholasticism assumed. From the Arabico-Aristotelic dialectics sprung perhaps the famous quarrel of the Realists and the Nominalists, which divided for a long time the scholastic teachers into two well-defined camps. Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and many others, studied the works of Aristotle in Latin versions made from the Hebrew; Albertus Magnus evidently took Ibn-Sînâ as his model in the composition of his metaphysical treatises. The great reputation which Arab philosophers then enjoyed, especially Ibn-Sînâ and Ibn-Roschd, is apparent from a passage in Dante's poem which places these two *savants* amongst the most illustrious of the Greeks, and mentions particularly Ibn-Roschd's great commentary.

"Euclide geometra e Tolommeo,  
Ippocrate, Avicenna, e Galieno  
Averrois che'l gran commento feo."<sup>a</sup>

After having thus given from M. Munk's interesting *mélanges* a general sketch of the history of metaphysical speculation amongst the Arabs, we shall now say a few words about the most remarkable representatives of that school of philosophers. The first, Al-Kendi,<sup>i</sup> surnamed by the Arabs the philosopher *par excellence*, flourished during the ninth century, and rendered himself celebrated on account of the prodigious number of works he composed on philosophy, mathematics, astronomy, politics, medicine, music, etc. He possessed, some say, the learning of the Greeks, the Persians, and the Hindus; at all events he must have known familiarly either the Greek language or the Syriac, for the Khalif Al-Mamoun commissioned him together with a number of erudite men to prepare translations of Aristotle and other metaphysicians. Cardan places him amongst the twelve men of genius who had appeared in the world before the sixteenth century.<sup>j</sup> Jealousy and fanaticism were very active against Al-Kendi; it is related that the Khalif Al-Motawakel caused his library to be confiscated, but that it was restored to him shortly before the Khalif's death: a fact which proves that Al-Kendi was still living in 861. Commentators ascribe to him about two hundred works, a list of which will be found in Casiri's *Bibliotheca Arabico-Hispana* (vol. i., pp. 353 and following). As his writings are very seldom quoted by other Arab philosophers, we are led to suppose that he had nothing to distinguish him in the

<sup>a</sup> *Inferno*, canto iv.

<sup>i</sup> Abu-Yusuf Ya'kub ben-Ishâk Al-Kendi.

<sup>j</sup> Cf. the treatise *De Subtilitate*, lib. xvi.

way of originality. The author of an anonymous Latin treatise, written during the thirteenth century, accuses him of several errors which reveal in him not only an upholder of astrological dreams, but also a mystic of the Alexandrine school. His views about the divine attributes shew that on this point he maintained in all their extent the doctrines of the Arabic Peripateticians.

M. Munk gives us a very detailed account of Al-Farabi,<sup>k</sup> who flourished during the tenth century (he died A.D. 950), and who has left considerable reputation as "one of the deepest, and, at the same time, most subtle commentators of Aristotle's works." He is often quoted by Guillaume d'Auvergne, Vincent de Beauvais, Albertus Magnus, etc. His chief production is a kind of enumeration or review of the sciences (I'hcâ al-'Oloum), the MS. of which is preserved at the Escorial library. An abridgment of it was published in 1638, at Paris, together with another treatise of the same philosopher, entitled *De Intellectu et Intellecto*, which had already been printed amongst the works of Ibn-Sînâ. M. Hauréau says of Al-Farabi:<sup>l</sup> "As a logician, he opened to the scholastic doctors, ideas which Abelard himself had not suspected. If the critics of the thirteenth century do not accuse him of having taught a large number of erroneous propositions, it is because they are insufficiently acquainted with him."

Ibn-Sînâ,<sup>m</sup> more generally known by the name of Avicenn, is so especially distinguished amongst the Mahometan philosophers that a somewhat detailed account of his life seems necessary. By birth he was a Persian; he was born in the year 370 of the Hegira (A.D. 980), and was brought up at Bokhara with the greatest care. He says himself in a short autobiographical notice which has been handed down to us, that at the age of ten he knew perfectly the Koran and a great portion of the profane sciences, particularly the principles of Mussulman law and of grammar; his precocity, he adds, was generally admired. His father received in his house a certain Abu-'Abd-Allah Natili who passed for a philosopher, and who was entrusted with the care of Ibn-Sînâ's education. The pupil, however, soon outstripped his master; without any assistance he perfected himself in the most difficult sciences, and became thoroughly master of mathematics, natural philosophy, logic, and metaphysics. He then applied himself assiduously to the study of medicine, under the direction of a Christian practitioner, named 'Tsa-ben-Ya'hya. When scarcely seventeen years old he had acquired such repu-

<sup>k</sup> Abu-naçr Mo'hamed ben Mo'hamed ben Tarkhân Al-Farabi.

<sup>l</sup> *Hist. de la Philosoph. Scholastique*, vol. i., p. 366.

<sup>m</sup> Abu-'Ali al-'Hosein ben-'Abd-Allah Ibn-Sînâ.

tation in that science, that the prince Nou'h ben-Mançur who resided at Bokhara, and who was then dangerously ill, sent for him; Ibn-Sînâ succeeded in curing his royal patient, and was by him rewarded in the handsomest manner. The immense library of the palace was thrown open to the young physician, who found there ample means of satisfying his thirst for knowledge. Ibn-Sînâ's career was marked by various vicissitudes which it would be tedious to relate here, and for a full detail of which we must refer the reader to M. Munk. He delivered on the theory and practice of medicine, lectures which have made his name popular even in Europe, where, during several centuries, his works were considered as authorities on that particular branch of learning. At the same time, he composed numerous metaphysical treatises, and we are sorry to say, rendered himself notorious by a riotous and dissolute way of living. Finally, attacked by a bowel-complaint, he increased his malady whilst accompanying his patron, the prince of Ispahan, in an expedition against Hamadan. Seeing his end approaching, he testified the deepest repentance for his past sins, he caused abundant alms to be distributed, and prepared himself to die as an orthodox Mahometan. He was fifty-seven years old when he expired (July 1037). The life of Ibn-Sînâ, written by his disciple Djordjâni (*Sorsanus*), has been translated into Latin, and printed as an introduction to several Latin editions of the great philosopher's treatises.

M. Munk gives the following account of Ibn-Sînâ's works: "They have, to a considerable extent, been preserved to us, and several of his most important ones, translated into Latin, have passed through numerous editions. The books which interest us more particularly, are the *Al-Schefâ* (the cure, or healing), and the *Al-Nadjdh* (the deliverance). The former was a vast cyclopædia in eighteen volumes; it still exists in almost an entire form in several MSS. of the Bodleian library, at Oxford. The second treatise, divided into three parts, is an abbreviation of the *Al-Schefâ*; Ibn-Sînâ wrote it at the request of some friends. The original text of the *Nadjdh* has been printed at Rome (1593, folio); it contains the logic, the physics, and the metaphysics, but it does not include the treatise on mathematics, which, according to the introduction, should have been placed third in order. We likewise possess Latin editions of various philosophical works of Ibn-Sînâ; they are, for the greater part, detached fragments of one or the other of the two books we have just noticed. We shall just name here a volume published at Venice, in 1495, folio, entitled, *Avicennæ peripatetici philosophi, ac medicorum facile primi, opera in lucem redacta, ac*

*nuper, quantum ars niti potuit, per canonicos emendata.* This volume contains the following treatises: 1. *Logica*; 2. *Sufficiencia* (this portion treats of natural philosophy, and appears to be an extract from the book *Al-Schefâ*, the title of which has been erroneously rendered *sufficiencia*); 3. *De Cælo et Mundo*; 4. *De Anima*; 5. *De Animalibus*; 6. *De Intelligentiis*; 7. *Alpharabius de Intelligentiis*; 8. *Philosophia prima*. Valtier published at Paris, in 1658, a *receuil* containing a French translation of Ibn-Sînâ's logic. A metrical treatise on logic, by the same author, was printed by M. Schmölders in his *Documenta Philosophiæ Arabum*."

Want of space prevents us from reproducing here M. Munk's interesting and detailed account of Ibn-Sînâ's philosophy,<sup>a</sup> and we must be satisfied with a general appreciation for which we are indebted to M. Hauréau.<sup>o</sup> Ibn-Sînâ belonged to the nominalist section of the Arabic school; he accepted frankly and unreservedly the definition of substance given by Aristotle: and therefore both Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas invoked his authority against their adversaries. Aristotle had laid down as a principle the eternity of motion, deducing from that pretended axiom all the consequences against which we are accustomed to protest, viz., the eternity of time, the necessary and indefinite succession of phenomena in space and in duration. Ibn-Sînâ endeavoured to grapple with the same subject; but to Aristotle's teaching he added views of his own. His proposition may be thus summarily stated: the eternal, the immutable, cannot have produced immediately that which is always undergoing change, that which is born only to die. In order then to explain the production of phenomena, we must suppose an infinite number of spheres evolved from one another, and going on, from the original immoveable Creator of motion, to the last being in the scale of creation. The first motor is the direct cause of motion, only within his own sphere: this sphere sets in motion the one immediately inferior to it, and so on. Now, what is the result of these successive acts? At each new impulse a fresh fact is manifested: this fact is the creation of a new sphere: but as the impulse given by the first motor has lost much of its energy when the most recent spheres are evolved from nothingness, the individuals which occupy them do not enjoy life to the same degree as the creatures of the superior spheres; and for this reason they are of a transient, perishable nature, whilst the first-born of the supreme motor are eternal as he is. We see from

<sup>a</sup> Cf. also Scharestâni's *History of Religious Sects*. Pages 348—429, of the Arabic text.

<sup>o</sup> *Hist. de la Phil. Scholastique*, vol. i., pp. 366—371.

this short *résumé* that Ibn-Sînâ's cosmogony was the result of a blending together of ideas derived from Aristotle with views characteristic of the Alexandrine theory of emanation. Such an association of doctrines is of frequent occurrence amongst the writers of the thirteenth century; and we find repeatedly the great chief of Peripatetism made responsible for propositions which are decidedly antagonistic to his method of explaining the world and creation in general.

With *Al-Gazâli*,<sup>p</sup> or as he is commonly called *Algazel*, we come to the representative of these mystic thinkers who protest against metaphysical speculation, and seek for the knowledge of God beyond the realms of logic. Abu-Hamed-Mo'hamed-ibn-Mo'hamed-al-Gazâli was born in the city of Tous, A.D. 1058. He was the son of a dealer in cotton-thread (*gazzal*), whence his name. Losing his father in early life, he was confided to the care of a Sufi whose influence extended through his subsequent career. On finishing his studies, he was appointed professor of theology at Bagdad. Here he achieved such splendid success, that all the Imaums became his zealous partizans. So great indeed was his renown, so ardent the admiration he inspired, that the Mahometans sometimes said, "If all Islam were to be destroyed, it would be but a slight loss, provided Al-Gazâli's work on the *Revivification of the Sciences of Religion* were preserved." This work, which treats of theology and of ethics, is divided into four parts;—referring to religious ceremonies, giving prescriptions for the various circumstances of life, and discussing *what destroys and what saves us* (vice and virtue). Al-Gazâli was so fond of retreat that on several occasions he resigned the public duties with which he was invested for the purpose of devoting himself entirely to contemplative exercises. Finally, he founded at Tous a Sufi monastery, and died there (A.D. 1111). The principal works of Al-Gazâli, besides the one just named, are 1st. The *Makâcid-al-falasifa* (tendencies of philosophers). 2nd. The *Tehafot al-falasifa* (destruction, or overthrow of philosophers); and 3rd. An autobiographical treatise, the title of which may be rendered *Deliverance from error and statements of the true condition of things*. On this work the Edinburgh reviewer<sup>q</sup> remarks:—"It is the history of a mind in pursuit of truth, and we can find no better title for it than that affixed to the posthumous work of Coleridge, *Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit*. It bears a very striking resemblance to the *Discours sur la Méthode*, and the *Meditations of Descartes*."

<sup>p</sup> Abu' Hamed-Mo'hamed ibn-Mo'hamed Al-Gazâli.

<sup>q</sup> Number for April, 1847. This article contains a very eulogistic, but not altogether a correct appreciation of the work of M. Schmolders.



From the numerous productions of Al-Gazâli, we gather that he was a man thoroughly versed in all the philosophical controversies of his time; he had studied the writings of the metaphysicians in order to be more able to refute them; and like so many of the mystics of mediæval and modern Europe, he makes of scepticism the means of arriving at faith.

If the author of the *Destructions of Philosophers* may be considered as representing the protest of faith against reason. Ibn-Bâdja, whose name has been corrupted into Aven-pace or Avempace, was, on the contrary, the champion of rationalism. He occupied the chief position, as a *savant*, amongst the Arabs of Spain. Not only was he an eminent metaphysician, but he knew thoroughly medicine, mathematics and astronomy; moreover, like Al-Farâbi, he was an accomplished musician, and particularly skilled on the lute. The incidents of his life are not well known. He was born at Saragossa towards the end of the eleventh century. In 1118 we find him at Seville, where he had probably taken up his residence permanently, and where he then composed several treatises having reference to logic. He likewise sojourned at Grenada; and at a later period he went over to Africa, where, it appears, he enjoyed much favour at the court of the Almoravid princes. He died in the five hundred and thirty-third year of the Hegira, at Fez (A.D. 1138). Some Arabic authors say that he was poisoned by physicians whose jealousy he had excited.

Ibn-Bâdjar is, according to M. Munk, the first of the Arabs of Spain who cultivated philosophy with success. His illustrious fellow-countryman Ibn-Tofail, who had not known him personally, but who flourished a short time after him, says that he surpassed all his contemporaries by the justness of his mind, by his depth and his penetration; he regrets at the same time that the affairs of this world, and a premature death, should not have allowed Ibn-Bâdja to throw open the treasures of his science; for, says he, his most important writings are incomplete, and those which he was enabled to finish are only small disquisitions hastily composed.\*

Without going through the list of Ibn-Bâdja's writings, we shall merely enumerate the two principal ones, viz., a treatise which can be entitled, in English, *The Government or Course of Living of the Solitary Man*, and the *Farewell Letter (Risâlet-al-*

---

\* Abu Beer Mo'hammed ben Ya'hya. On his various surnames, cf. M. Munk's note, p. 383.

\* . . . nisi quod eum occupatum tenerit mundus, donec ipsum præriperet mors, antiquam pateferent thesauri scientiæ ejus, aut vulgarentur occulta sapientiæ ipsius; ac pleraque, quæ e scriptis ejus reperiuntur, imperfecta sunt et fine mutila. *Philos. Autodidactus*. Page 15.

*widd*). This last-named production contains reflexions on the *primum mobile* in us, or on what gives the impulse to the intellectual man, what constitutes the true end of human existence and of science, (namely, to draw nearer to God and to receive the *active intellect* which emanates from him); the author adds a few very vague and very obscure words on the permanence of the human soul. With reference to this last topic, Ibn-Bâdja professed already the doctrine afterwards developed by Ibn-Roschd, that is to say, the theory of the *unity of souls*, which produced such sensation in the Christian metaphysical schools, and was refuted by Thomas Aquinas and Albertus Magnus. The title, *Farewell Letter*, comes probably from the fact that the author, on the point of undertaking a long journey, addressed this work to one of his young friends, in order that, if he should not see him again, he might leave him his ideas on the important subjects which are there discussed. It is this letter which, in the Latin version of the works of Ibn-Roschd, is called *epistola expeditionis*. We find throughout its contents a manifest desire to rehabilitate science and metaphysical speculations, which can alone, according to Ibn-Bâdja, lead us to the knowledge of nature, and which, *through the help coming from above*, enables man to enjoy an acquaintance with himself. The author blames Al-Gazâli for having endeavoured to recommend the indulgence of a kind of mystic enthusiasm; if we admit his statement, Al-Gazâli has deceived both himself and others, when he pretended in his book, entitled *Al-Monkidh* (the deliverance from error), that whilst living in solitude, the intellectual world was opened before him, and that he saw then divine things, experiencing thereby intense enjoyment, which, for all contemplative persons, is the object of meditation.

The above *résumé* is all that time will permit us to give respecting Ibn-Bâdja, whose chief work, the *Course of Living of the Solitary Man*, M. Munk has analyzed with his usual care. Referring our reader to this part of the *Mélanges de Philosophie*, we shall now say a few words of Ibn-Tofâil, whose *Philosophus Autodidactus*<sup>†</sup> has rendered so illustrious. He was born about the beginning of the eleventh century in a small town of Andalusia, and became a great favourite at the court of the Almohades by his talents as a physician, a metaphysician, a mathematician, and a poet. After having discharged the office of secretary to the governor of Grenada, he was attached as vizir and physician to the person of Abu-Ya'kub Yusuf, second king of the Almohade dynasty, who reigned from 1163—1184,

---

<sup>†</sup> Abu-Becr Mo'hammed ben-'Abd-al-Malic Ibn-Tofâil.

and that prince honoured him with his friendship. It appears that Ibn-Tofail practised as a physician in Grenada, and wrote two volumes on the science of medicine. 'Abd-al-Wâ'hid, an Arabic historian of the thirteenth century, who had been acquainted with Ibn-Tofail's son, gives us some curious details on our philosopher's intimacy with king Yusuf, and declares having seen several works composed by him, and amongst others the autograph manuscript of a treatise on the soul. The same historian quotes some of Ibn-Tofail's poems. It was he who introduced Ibn-Roschd to his royal patron. The king having one day expressed the wish that a *savant* well versed in the writings of Aristotle would give a clear and reasoned analysis of them, Ibn-Tofail engaged Ibn-Roschd to undertake the work, adding that his own advanced age, and his numerous occupations, prevented him from attempting it himself. Ibn-Roschd consented and composed the analysis we still possess. Ibn-Tofail died at Morocco A.D. 1185; king Ya'kub, surnamed Al-Mançur, who had ascended the throne during the previous year, assisted at his funeral.

Ibn-Tofail belonged, it seems, to the sect of the *Ischrâkyîn*, which we have already referred to, and he endeavoured to solve in his own way the problem which had so much puzzled the Mahometan philosophers, namely, the *conjunction* or *union* of man with the principle of intelligence and with God. Dissatisfied with the explanation given by Al-Gazâli, explanation which has for its substratum only a certain mystical enthusiasm, he followed the footsteps of Ibn-Bâdja, and, like him, shewed the successive development of our ideas in a man thrown upon his own resources, free from the pre-occupations and the influence of society. But he improved upon that view, and aimed at describing a being who should *never* have felt the influence derived from the association with others, in whom reason would have awoken spontaneously, and who would thus have arrived successively by his own efforts, and by the impulse arising from the principles of all intelligence, to an understanding of the secrets of nature, and of the abstrusest metaphysical questions. Such is the purport of the well-known treatise composed by Ibn-Tofail, under the title, '*Hayy Ibn-Yakdhân*, an allegorical name given by the author to his hero, and which means *the living son of the vigilant*. The title *Philosophus Autodidactus*, which Pococke has adopted for his Latin translation, shews perfectly well the character of the work." It is a kind of metaphysical

\* Quarto: Oxford, 1671. Second edition, 1700. The MS. consulted by Pococke gives to the philosopher the name *Abu-Djafar*, but evidently through some mistake. Cf. M. Munk, p. 417.

novel, reminding us of Condillac's famous theory on the origin of ideas, and of Buffon's ingenious description of Adam's gradual progress towards knowledge. The only difference is that the French philosophers considered their subject from the sensational point of view, whereas Ibn-Tofail's conclusion is openly and avowedly Pantheistic. The last goal which the self-taught 'Hayy reaches is absolute separation from all that pertains to the senses and to the imagination. He annihilates himself, so to say, and allows nothing to remain except thought alone. What he sees in such a condition baffles his descriptive powers, and it is by images that he represents what he has found in the spiritual world. He believes himself to be completely identified with the Supreme Being; the whole universe seems to him to exist only in God, whose light is diffused everywhere, and manifests itself more or less in all created beings, according to their degree of purity. Multiplicity exists exclusively for the body and for the senses; it disappears entirely for him who is detached from matter.

As a conclusion to his work Ibn-Tofail introduces a second character, Asâl, for whom religion has been the means of arriving at the knowledge of truth. His purpose in so doing was to prove that there is no discrepancy whatever between reason and faith. Metaphysics are for cultivated minds what religion is to the illiterate multitude, and whilst these are saved by believing the letter of the Koran and its obvious teaching, the others go beyond the anthropomorphisms of the sacred writings, and discover there the highest verities. Strengthened by mutual converse and instruction, Asâl and 'Hayy finally start on a kind of missionary work, but they meet with no success, and, retiring altogether from society, they spend the remainder of their life in austerities and contemplation.

Ibn-Roschd\* closes the list of the Arabic philosophers, and as he is the last representative of a school of thinkers whose services to the cause of metaphysics cannot be too much valued, so he proved also the most illustrious and the most influential. His name resounded through all the lecture-rooms of Europe; his doctrines had the honour of calling forth a bull from the Pope, and of being refuted by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, amongst many others. M. Munk\* has given in the life of Ibn-Roschd all the details that can interest the reader; we shall content ourselves with referring to his biographical sketch, or to the volume published some years ago by M. Renan, and we shall merely say here that he was born A.D. 1126, at Cordova, and that he died at Morocco A.D. 1198, aged seventy-two years

---

\* Abul-Walid Mo'hammed ibn-A'hmed ibn-Roschd.

and a few months. Ibn-Roschd is the Aristotelic commentator *par excellence*; the first interpreters of the Stagyrte had explained only some portions of his works; with the exception of the *Politics*, with which he was not acquainted, Ibn-Roschd applied himself to the entire cycle of Aristotle's productions, and composed on each treatise three commentaries, one very explicit, embracing a number of theoretical digressions, the second less detailed, and a third one which was only a kind of paraphrase of the text. Besides these labours as an interpreter, Ibn-Roschd left likewise a great number of original treatises on various branches of human learning, and amongst others a controversial book entitled *The Destruction of Destruction*, and which was intended to refute the work, already alluded to, of Al-Gazâli. M. Munk remarks that Ibn-Roschd never claimed the honour of propounding an original system of philosophy; he gave himself out as a mere commentator of Aristotle, to whose teaching, he said, no one ever could add anything worthy of attention. "However, like the other Arabic philosophers, Ibn-Roschd studied Aristotle through the medium of neo-Platonist commentators, and thereby he modified considerably the peripatetic system. Besides, in the doctrine of Aristotle there are many obscure points, with reference to which the old interpreters are not agreed, or which they have not attempted to explain; and, whilst pretending to discover Aristotle's true opinions, Ibn-Roschd has often, though quite unconsciously, mooted doctrines which are peculiarly his own, and which, therefore, can boast of a certain degree of originality." The extreme boldness of his theory of intelligence could not but strike all the champions of orthodoxy, both amongst the Moslems and amongst the Christians. Going further than Ibn-Sînâ himself, he withdraws from the soul all that is spiritual in its nature, and reduces it to the transient and radically sensationalist capacity of being modified by material objects, and of retaining the impressions produced by them. This hypothesis once admitted, not only every rational knowledge becomes inexplicable, but all personal identity disappears, whether, as materialists assert, the soul is confounded with the body, or whether it becomes lost in the depths of universal life and of infinite thought. Ibn-Roschd's theory on the origin of beings completed his psychological Pantheism, and gave to it a still more serious character. No philosopher professed more openly the doctrine that generation and death are a mere change in the conditions of existence; that, absolutely speaking, nothing is born, and nothing perishes, and that the life of the world is the necessary evolution of an eternal, uncreated substance. Together with creation he denied provi-

dence, and allowed the Deity to remain in his system only as the immoveable and permanent principle of all things.

M. Munk has the following remarks on Ibn-Roschd's writings:—"If we still possess the great majority of them, we are indebted for this fact to the Jews alone. The perseverance with which the Almohade princes persecuted philosophy and philosophers did not permit Arabic copies of the works of Ibn-Roschd to spread about. They have at all times been extremely rare, and, during the sixteenth century, Scaliger thought that it would be difficult to find in the whole of Europe even one of them. They do not appear on the rich catalogue of Arabic MSS. which the Paris Imperial Library contains, and we know that only a very small number are to be met with in other collections. But the works of the metaphysician of Cordova, proscribed by Mahometan fanaticism, were received with the greatest eagerness by the learned rabbis of Spain and of Provence; Hebrew translations of them were made, which have been preserved in several libraries, more especially in the *Bibliothèque Impériale*. . . . We have equally to thank the Jews for printed Latin translations; those of Abraham de Balmis are tolerably written, and if the others are sometimes rather hard to understand, nay, even unintelligible, we have, to rectify them, the Hebrew versions, which are of the most scrupulous fidelity. For the Arabic student they can replace the originals, of which they are a faithful transcript."

As we have already said, Ibn-Roschd was the representative of Arabic philosophy in its highest state of maturity; after his death no metaphysician worthy of the name came forward to take his place, and in course of time the very doctrines which, under the designation of *Averroism*, had divided the schoolmen into two great camps, were comparatively forgotten. We think, however, that they are well worth the attention of real students; and those, more particularly, who apply themselves to the critique of Aristotle's doctrines can scarcely deem their investigations complete unless they extend them to the writings of Ibn-Roschd, and of the other Moslem commentators. Let us add, that in the prosecution of such a study they cannot take a safer guide than M. Munk's *Mélanges de Philosophie Juive et Arabe*.

GUSTAVE MASSON.

# THE REVELATION OF THE BLESSED APOSTLE PAUL.

TRANSLATED FROM AN ANCIENT SYRIAC MANUSCRIPT,

By Rev. JUSTIN PERKINS, D.D.,

MISSIONARY OF THE A. B. C. F. M. AT ORÛMIAH.\*

## *Introductory Note by the Committee of Publication.*

THE ancient Syriac manuscript from which is made the following translation, was sent to this country some years since by the late Rev. David T. Stoddard, missionary among the Nestorian Christians of Orûmiah and its vicinity. It was obtained among the Nestorians, and is of course written in their character, upon the usual coarse brown paper, and covers thirty-two leaves, which are about nine inches high and six inches broad. It was placed in the hands of Dr. Perkins for translation about two years since (in 1862), when he was on the point of returning to Persia, and his version was received from Orûmiah late in 1863. From his accompanying letter, dated at Orûmiah, April 1st, 1863, the following is an extract :—

“ I return you herewith the Revelation of St. Paul. . . . The following pages are a translation which I have just made, quite literal rather than smooth, for reasons which will readily commend themselves to you. I need say but little by way of comment on this medley of pious fraud and of folly. It will speak for itself. The Syriac is so good that I am inclined to give it the credit of considerable age. We seldom see so good a Syriac style written by the best Nestorian scholars at the present time.”

Respecting the age of the work, we have no other clue than that hinted at by Dr. Perkins, as furnished by the character of the language in which it is written. It may be conjectured to be a Syriac version of one of the many apocryphal works upon its theme known to have been current among the early Christians, respecting which Fabricius (*Codex Apoc. N. T.*, vol. i., p. 943, etc.) gives the following notices.

1. An *Anabiticum Pauli* mentioned by Epiphanius (*Heres.*, xviii., 38), which was in the hands of the Gnostic sect of Cajani or Cainites (in the second century), and was held to contain the revelations made to Paul when he ascended to the third heaven (2 Cor. xii. 2—4). This same book is cited by Michael Glycas (in the twelfth century), *Annal.*, ii., p. 120.

2. Another *Apocalypsis Pauli*, in use among certain monks in the fourth century, and referred to by Augustin (Tract 98 in

---

\* Reprinted from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. viii. 1864.

Johannem), Sozomen (*Hist.*, vii., 19), Theophylact (on 2 Cor. xii. 4), and other writers. This (according to Sozomen) was said by some to have been found in the times of the Emperor Theodosius, in a marble box under the house in which Paul had lived at Tarsus.

3. Grabe (*Spic.*, i., p. 85) states that, in the library of Merton College, Oxford, there is a manuscript, *Revelatio Pauli* (Cod. xiii., N 2, Ant., fol. 77 b), which professes to contain the disclosures made by St. Michael to the apostle during the three days following his conversion. In this was included also a view of the punishments of purgatory and hell—another feature not belonging to the work mentioned by Augustin. The Oxford manuscript is supposed by Fabricius to be a much later production.

4. Marcus, Patriarcha Alexandrinus, at the beginning of the thirteenth century, states that various works bearing the title of *Visiones Pauli* were extant “in orientalibus et meridionalibus regionibus.”

The work sent by Dr. Perkins contains a visit to hell as well as heaven, differing in this respect from the work mentioned by Augustin, and so far agreeing with the Oxford manuscript; but it differs from the latter in being founded on the passage in 2 Cor. xii. 2—4, instead of the narrative of the Apostle’s conversion; with Augustin’s Apocalypsis, again, it appears to agree, as concerns the tradition of its original discovery.

---

*Preface by the Syrian Translator, or a Transcriber.*

Beloved of my soul, I will make known unto you, from the Holy Scriptures, divine visions, which the Holy Ghost hath made known to the prophets in mystery, respecting the providential dealing [the leading] of Christ our Lord, before he assumed a body, in the end of times. So the blessed Paul saw what was about to happen to the race of mortals after the resurrection.

Hear, then, ye who say that perhaps the Revelation of the blessed, holy Paul is not true. Hear, my master, the reader; I acquaint you, on this subject, from the Holy Scriptures and true witnesses. Hear, my master, about the soul when it departs from the body. Affection of [after] glory, and of intelligence, wins souls there, either for evil or for good. For, until the resurrection, there is neither enjoyment nor torment, but this awaking [earnest expectation]. Therefore our Lord Jesus Christ anticipated and made known unto great Paul. In a mystery he



made known to him everything that would happen to the race of mortals, from the reward of the good even unto the evil.

But that we may discourse on the subject on which we now enter—That was a vision which Moses, the chief of the prophets, saw. He beheld a fire, kindled in a bush, without consuming it. Was it not a mystery [emblem] that divinity was about to descend and dwell in humanity, and the humanity would not be consumed before the might of divinity?

And when Israel warred with the Philistines, and with every foreign people, Moses crossed himself with a sign of the cross, before the eyes of all Israel, by adjusting his hands like a cross, at that time. And as Moses crucified the brazen serpent in the wilderness, so also our Lord says in the Holy Gospel: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, so also must the Son of man be lifted up."

And other things about our Lord are a vision that Daniel the prophet saw. He saw a stone cut out without hands; and the beating to pieces the great image, was not this the descent [of Christ] without removal [alienation from his original place], and the abolishing of idols?

The fleece—that which Gideon saw, which received dew from on high—was it not the mystery that a virgin was about to conceive without seed?

So also when the ark of Noah passed the four corners of the world.

And when Melchizedek, the priest, offered a cake of bread and a cup of wine, and Abraham, the father of nations, inquired: "What is this mystery?" Melchizedek, the priest, said: "Christ is about to descend from heaven, and assume a body from a virgin, and offer his body, in bread and wine, for his disciples. Blessed is he who partakes of it." Where was the mystery of the sacrament of the body and the blood of our Lord at that period?

So also that which David, the prophet, saw by the Spirit, about the passion of our Lord, and his crucifixion, saying: "They pierced my hands and my feet, and all my bones bewailed," etc. That also which David spake about the resurrection, saying: "Thou hast not given thy just one to see corruption;" and other things that are said of it.

Like as Jonah constituted a likeness of the burial of our Lord in the belly of a fish.

The garments which Jeremiah buried, are they not a mystery of the rending off of Israel, and of the changing of the law?

So, too, what the prophet Joel saw about the sufferings of our Lord, and wept, and preached, and said: "I will give signs

in heaven and wonders on the earth—blood, and vapour, and smoke ; and the sun shall be turned to darkness, and the moon to blood, before the great and dreadful day of the Lord come.”

Like as Isaiah, the honoured one among prophets, saw, and spake from his mouth, who gave witness of his son, saying : “ This is my beloved Son, in whom my soul is well pleased. I will put my Spirit upon him.” Like that which he said of St. John the Baptist : “ Behold my servant, in whom I am well pleased.”

Like those twelve stones, which Joshua, the son of Nun, took, when he divided Jordan before him ; was not this the mystery of the twelve apostles, who should be with our Lord beforehand with others ?

Like that stone on which Jeremiah the prophet stood, which was the New Jerusalem, the church of the nations—the holy, universal church, of which Isaiah prophesied. Therefore our Lord also called St. Simon, the chief of the apostles, a stone. For as a huge stone will not shake, nor move, from the violent waves of evil and hard winds ; nor melt, nor dissolve, from the moisture of water ; so the chosen church of Christ will not shake, nor move, from opposing waves and the sons of perdition, that may roar against it with the hard winter of the wicked one.

Behold and see, O thou who doubtst concerning the Revelation of great Paul, all these mysteries and similitudes which the prophets have seen in all ages. In mystery did not the Holy Ghost make known unto them, and speak ? He who doubteth in his mind, how there was a cross at that time, and the mystery of the cross, and other divine mysteries and visions of that period—[to him I say] so the blessed Paul saw by a mystery ; the thing that he saw was whatsoever shall be the reward, after the resurrection.

This is a great wonder, that in one case we receive his testimony, and in the other deny his preaching. How so ? Is blessed Paul divided ? Is half of him true, and half of him a deceiver and a liar ? God forbid it of the holy and blessed Paul, the divine apostle. All we faithful ones, partakers of holy baptism, believe, with all our hearts, and all our strength, and all our minds, in the Holy Gospel of Paul the apostle, and the other apostles, his companions, that they preached it for us. And whoever is doubtful of the Revelation of great Paul, let him know that there is no sacrifice for propitiation for his sins ; but know thou that his torments shall be without mercy. Consider and count him one with the heathen, and persecutors of apostles and martyrs. Whoever believes not in the Revelation of the blessed Paul will suffer his torments within, till he goes

to the torments of the judgment of hell, in everlasting fire. These true proofs will suffice for him who knows his wisdom, and is pure in heart. But fools and swine shall perish, according to the words of our Lord, which he spake to us in the Holy Gospel: "Give not that which is holy unto dogs, and cast not your pearls before swine." Behold, O thou that art sceptical about the Revelation of Paul, how much better is the name of a man than that of a dog or of a swine! Therefore let us all in truth believe, that we may not be called by these hated names by our Lord. But let us please [him], and believe in every spiritual mystery—those divine visions which the Holy Ghost hath made known to them who delight in his love and are doers of his will.

Praise to the Father;  
 To the Son, worship;  
 To the Holy Ghost, lifting up [ascription],  
 From all earthly tribes that are visible—  
 At all times, for ever and for ever.  
 Amen.

The apology for the Revelation of Paul, the divine apostle, is finished.

Again, I will write [copy] the Revelation of blessed Paul, the apostle—

May the Lord help me through his prayers. Amen.

#### REVELATION OF THE BLESSED APOSTLE PAUL.

The word of the Lord came unto me, saying: Son of man, go, speak to the people of the land—How long will ye sin? How long will ye add sin to sin? How long will ye provoke God, and say: We are the children of the living God? But the works of the devil ye do, and walk in his commandments. Know ye, and behold, all natures, and all creatures, are subject to the living God; but the sons of men rule over all creatures.

The Sun first complained to God, against the creatures, and the sons of men, and said: "O Lord God, mighty and all-powerful, how long wilt thou behold the iniquity and the wickedness of men: fornication, and adultery, and murder, and theft, and avarice, and oppression? All these the sons of men commit on earth. Grant me permission, O Lord, that I may take vengeance upon them, and without mercy destroy them by burning flame, and make known thy power unto them, that they may understand, that thou only art God, the Father of Truth." And there came unto it a voice, saying: "I have heard and seen everything, and know; and nothing is concealed

from me ; for my eyes do behold, and my ears do hear ; but my goodness and long-suffering bear with them ; peradventure they may turn and repent, and their sins be forgiven. And if they do not repent and come unto me, I will judge them with a righteous judgment ; and will reward every man according to his deeds.”

Then also the Moon, and the whole circle of the Stars, complained unto God, and said : “ O Lord God, mighty and all-powerful, thou alone knowest everything that the sons of men do : adultery, and murder, and the shedding of blood ; and refrainest from them. Grant me permission, O Lord, that I may take vengeance on them as they deserve ; and make known unto them thy power, that they may know that thou alone art God, the Father of Truth.” And, lo, the voice of God unto them, and saying unto them : “ I know all these things, and nothing is hidden from me ; in my goodness and long-suffering I bear ; peradventure they may repent ; and if they do not turn unto me, I will judge them with a righteous judgment, and will reward every man according to his works.”

How many times did the Seas and the Rivers cry unto God, and say : “ O Lord God, mighty and all-powerful, the sons of men, by their works, offend against thy holy name, through their sorcery, and their fornication, and their lying, and their wicked conversations [walks], and by their going astray. Grant us permission, O Lord, that we may rise, and cover the whole earth ; and make known to the sons of men, that they may know, that thou alone art the mighty Lord God.” And a voice came unto them, saying : “ I know everything, and nothing is hidden from me ; but, in my goodness and long-suffering, I bear ; peradventure they may turn and repent ; and if they turn not, and come unto me, I will judge them with a righteous judgment, and will reward every man according to his works.”

Then also the Earth cried out to God, and said : “ O Lord God, all-powerful, I am distressed more than all the creatures ; I bear up under the sins of men ; their adultery and their fornication, and their murders, and their iniquity, and all the wickedness that they do, their sorcery, and their witchcraft ; as father rises up against his son and slays him, and son against his father ; and brother against his brother rises up, and defiles his bed ; so also neighbour wrongs his neighbour. Even some of those who are called priests, and continually offer sacrifices to thy holy name—they also walk in craftiness. I therefore am more oppressed than all the creatures ; therefore I am not willing to yield harvests unto them. Grant me permission, O Lord, that I may destroy their harvests, in a manner that they may

not bring forth, that they may know thy greatness, after they have been punished." And there came a voice unto it, saying: "Everything my eyes behold; and nothing is hidden from me. I bear with them in my long-suffering; and I judge them in my goodness; peradventure they may turn and their sins be forgiven. If they do not repent, and come unto me, I will judge with a righteous judgment, and reward every man according to his works."

Look on this, O ye sons of men, and see that everything which God has created has a zeal for him; but the sons of men forget him. It is not proper that we forget the long-suffering of God unto us, every day. Repent, therefore, O sons of men; for the Lord is merciful, and of tender compassion; repent of your wicked deeds, and praise God without ceasing, by night and by day. And more especially in the evening and the morning, pray on account of your sins, on account of evil temptations and snares; for every creature of God praises him always in the morning; and praise is becoming for him from every one. It is also necessary that we offer unto him good works, every one for himself.

Everything that a man does, from morning until evening, whether good or bad—the guardian angel goes forth, in mourning and sorrow on account of men, unto God—namely, he who preserves a mortal from all injuries; for in the image of God is he, wherefore the guardianship of the sons of men is committed to an angel. When the angel sees a mortal committing wickedness, the angel is afraid of him; for all the angels, guardians of the sons of men, from morning unto morning, go in before God, and everything that a mortal does is known—therefore, prayer is appointed at that time, that, peradventure, at the hour when the angel of the Lord goeth, the mortal may be engaged in prayer; and they present before him the works of man, whatever he doeth, by day and by night.

Remember, therefore, O ye sons of men, and praise God all your days; and especially, at the time when the angels worship. For first do the holy angels run, that they may reach that hour which is appointed to them for service, with their companions and friends; so also we, the sons of men. Like as the other angels, in their time, run before God, and his Spirit goeth forth to meet them, and a voice cometh to them: "Whence come my armies, and my glorious angels, the messengers of glad tidings?" and those angels of the righteous enter, and say unto him: "O Lord, now from holy men, who have come out from the world, for thy holy name, have we come: some of them dwell in caves; and others in holes of the earth; weeping, and distressed, and

tormented, on account of their sins and the sins of this world; while they are hungry and thirsty, for thy name's sake; and they have girded their loins, and hold a fast hand on good works; and cry out and say continually: 'Our heart is ready in God;' and their mouths bless, and praise, and give thanks, at all hours, while they weep and make lamentation; and we also with them, who are their angels, we beseech thee, O Lord."

And, behold, the voice of God unto them, saying: "Know ye, therefore, O ye my angels, and my ministers, that you are here; but my grace, and my remembrance, which is my beloved Son, is with them; and he succours them in their lives, and in their death glorifies them; and will not cast them off, neither by night nor by day; for their souls are the dwelling-place of my beloved Son."

And when those angels of the righteous departed, behold <sup>(10)</sup> other angels came to worship at the proper hour; and the Spirit of God went forth to meet them; and, lo, the voice of God unto them, saying: "Whither do ye come, and laden always with the faults and sins of the sons of men, tidings not agreeable?" And those angels answered and said: "O Lord, we have come from among the sons of men, those on whom thy name is called; and in the flood of the world they have made for themselves habitations of devils; and are in the delirium and the erring of wicked devils in all their works; and a single pure prayer before thee, from all their hearts, they have not prayed. Further, why, O Lord, shall we pray? and why is it needful for us to do service any more, for these sinful sons of men?" And, behold, the voice of God unto them, saying: "Cease not from their service; peradventure they may repent; and if they do not repent and come unto me, I will judge them with a righteous judgment."

Again, after these things, I saw one of the spiritual ones coming unto me, and he caught me, by the Holy Ghost, and carried me to the third heaven; and the angel answered and said unto me: "Follow me, Paul, that I may shew unto thee the place of the saints, that thou mayest know whither they go, when they depart from the world. Then I will carry thee to the abyss beneath, and shew thee the souls of sinners, where they dwell after the resurrection; that thou mayest know, O Paul, what will be their reward." And I followed the angel, who made known to me all these things; and he carried me above; and I looked upon the firmament of heaven; and I saw that there were there principalities who had been in the world; and there were there spirits of deception, who lead astray the heart of the sons of men from God; and there are the evil spirits of

accusation, and fornication, and the love of money, and all those things in which they walked; and, behold, they are gathered for witness; even all the evil spirits that are under heaven.

And I saw there angels in whom there is no mercy; and their faces were full of wrath; every tooth they had protruded from their mouths, and their eyes sparkled like lightning; and the hair of their heads was thick, and very strong; and as it were a flame of fire proceeded from their mouths. And I inquired of the angel who was with me, and said: "What are these, my Lord?" and he said to me: "These are angels in whom there is no mercy, who are sent after the souls of sinners and the wicked, after those who had not repentance before they departed out of the world; who did not believe our God, nor wait for his salvation, that there might be unto them a Helper."

And again, I saw above, on high, other angels, whose faces shone like the sun, and they had bound their loins with girdles, in the likeness of gold and pearls; and they held in their hands crowns; and the seal of God was upon them; and they were clothed with garments, and the name of the living God was stamped upon them; and they were united in humility and love. And I inquired of the angel who was with me: "What are these, my Lord?" and he said: "These are angels of righteousness, who are sent after the souls of the righteous." And I said to the angel who was with me: "Is this the way of every man unto God?" and he said: "Yes." And again he said unto me: "As for the righteous, when they depart from the world, these angels come unto them, and are their helpers. They have no fright, and do not fear, when these go forth to meet them; and they carry them before the throne of God." Then I said to the angel who was conversing with me: "O my Lord, wilt thou not grant to me an opportunity that I may see the souls of the righteous, how they depart out of the world?" and he said: "Come thou, Paul, and I will shew thee as I have said." Then I looked, and I saw all the earth, and the creatures upon it; and they appeared as nothing, and did not exist. And I said: "Is this the creation? and are these men, and the abundance of the world?" and the angel said unto me: "These are sinners, who sin from morning until evening." Then I saw as it were a dark cloud spread over all the world; and I said to the angel who was with me: "What is this, O my Lord?" and he said unto me: "This is the iniquity mixed with the prayer of the sons of men; who, when they pray, in their heart ponder evil; and the light of their prayer becomes darkness." And I, Paul, groaned, and I wept. Then I said unto him: "O my Lord, wilt thou not grant that I may see in what manner the souls of the

righteous and of the wicked depart out of this world?" and he said unto me: "Paul, look down, and see the thing which thou requestest." And I looked, and saw, and beheld one of the sons of men fallen nigh unto death. And the angel said unto me: "This is a just one, and righteous in all his works." And I saw everything which he did for God standing before him, in the hour of his departure from the world. Then I, Paul, perceived that he was righteous who was now dying: and he found for himself rest, even before dying. And there approached him wicked angels (when a righteous one departs, they do not find a place by him), and those good angels ruled over that righteous one. And they drew out of him the soul, while alluring it with rest; and again they restored it to him, while inviting it and saying: "O soul, be assured, as for this thy body, O holy one, thou wilt return into it, in the resurrection; and thou wilt receive the promises of the living God with all the saints." Then that soul was carried from the body; and they inquired after its health, as though it had grown up with them; and they took delight with it in love; and they said unto it; "Blessed art thou, O happy soul, which, every day, didst perform the will of God, and now takest delight in pleasures." And there came to meet it he who was its guardian in its life, and said to it: "O soul of mine, be of good courage, and be joyful, and I will rejoice over thee, that thou hast done the will of our Lord, all the days of thy life; and I carried thy good works, by day and by night, before God." And again I turned, and said to my soul: "Do not fear, in that, behold, thou seest a place thou hast never seen." And while I was beholding these things, that spirit was lifted up from the earth, that it might ascend to heaven. And there went out to meet it wicked powers, those that are under heaven. And there reached it the spirit of error, and said: "Whither dost thou presume, O soul? and art thou running that thou mayest enter heaven? Stop, that we may see; perhaps there is in thee something that belongs to us, that we may narrate a little." And that soul was bound there; and there was a fight between the good angels and the evil angels. And when that spirit of deception saw, it bewailed with a loud voice, and said: "Woe unto thee, O soul, that we have found in thee nothing of ours! and lo, all the angels and the spirits are helping thee against us; and behold, these all are with thee; thou hast passed out from us." And there went forth another spirit, the spirit of the tempter, and the spirit of fornication; and they came to meet it; and when they saw it, they wept over it, and said: "How has this soul escaped from us! It did the will of God on earth, and behold,



the angels help it and pass it, and pass it along from us." And all the principalities and evil spirits came to meet it, even unto it; and they did not find in it anything that was from them; and they were not able to do anything to it; and they gnashed their teeth upon that soul, and said: "How hast thou escaped from us?" And the angel which conducted it in life answered and said unto them: "Return, O ye mortified ones; ye have no way of access to it; with many artifices ye enticed when it was on earth, and it did not listen to you."

And after this, I heard the voice of myriads of angels praising God and saying: "Rejoice and be glad, O soul; be strengthened, and do not fear." And they marvelled much at the soul, when they saw it holding the seal of the living God in its hand. And thus they were giving it heart, and saying: "We all rejoice over thee, that thou hast done the will of thy Lord." And they carried it and placed it before the throne of the living God, while they all rejoiced with it. And there was a great cessation; afterwards, silence reigned for a considerable time. And afterwards, the angels ceased—to wit, those angels that worshipped before the footstool of God with that soul. And there began the angel, who was the guide of that soul, and said: "O Lord God, merciful and compassionate, remember this soul, and do not forget it; and do unto it according to the abundance of thy mercy, and according to thy right judgments." And a voice was heard, saying: "He is just."

And the spirit of the Lord, the same which guided it in life, said: "I am that spirit of life that dwelt in it; and I found to myself rest. Do unto it, O Lord, according to thy right judgments." And a voice was heard, saying: "As that did not distress thee, we will not distress that; and as it shewed mercy, we also will shew unto it mercy." And they committed it to Michael, the chief of the angels, the same who stands at the door of life; and he commanded it [the spirit] that it should carry it [the soul] to Paradise, to remain until the day on which it shall return to its body, in the resurrection; and it shall take delight with its body, in that everlasting bliss and delight with the saints.

And after this, I heard a voice, saying: "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and very right thy judgments; and with thee there is no partiality." This was the voice of the myriads of the adoring Cherubim, and the holy Seraphim.

And I saw twenty-nine aged ones, who were adoring, and praising, and saying: "Thou art righteous, O Lord, and very right are thy judgments; and there is not with thee partiality; and thou rewardest every man according to his works."

And the angel who was with me answered and said : " Dost thou know, Paul ? every man who doeth good findeth for himself rest when he goeth out from the world ; and everything excellent and good is rewarded."

And the angel said : " Look down, Paul, and see ;" and I looked down and saw ; and behold, another soul departing from the body. And I said unto him : " O my Lord, whose soul is this ?" and he said unto me : " Know thou that this man was wicked ; and he provoked God by day and by night, while he said : ' There is nothing else for us in the world, except that we eat and drink, with the young ; for who has gone down to hell and come back ? or told us that there is a judgment ?' " And I saw that bitter hour ; and I saw all his wickedness coming before him and after him, while it encompassed him before his eyes ; and I saw that hour embittered to him from the judgment that was to come. And that man was saying : " O that I had not been born, nor brought forth in the world !" And I saw that the good angels descended to meet him : and they looked upon him, and saw darkness encompassing him round about, and the foul odour of his evil deeds, so that they could not come nigh unto him ; and there came also those evil angels. When that soul saw both parties, it was shaken. And those good angels saw that it had not one good work ; and when they fled away from it, those evil angels took the rule over it, and pulled it out in severe anger and haste. And when it went out, they turned it back three times, saying unto it : " Look, O miserable soul, upon thy body, and think of thy house ; as for that from which thou departest, again wilt thou return unto it, in the day of the resurrection, and thou wilt be recompensed, all that is proper, for thy wickedness."

And when they pulled it out, that daring one groaned in bitterness ; and the angel who had conducted it in life ran before it, saying unto it : " O miserable soul, I am thy angel that carried thy sins, day and night, before God. How often did I say unto thee : ' Do not despise the commandments of thy Lord.' If I had power over myself, I would not do service for thee ; no, not one hour in a day : but I have not power over myself : for he who created thee in his image and his likeness, he commanded us that we should do service for you ; for God himself in kindness waited, that, peradventure, ye would turn and not perish. Come, O soul ; thou didst not awake in regard to the righteous judge, Him who casts not aside any man ; but every one is rewarded according to his work. Know thou, O soul, that from this time onward I will be a stranger unto thee." And that miserable soul was made ashamed ; and its own angel

distressed it. And when it arrived at the door of the firmament, that soul saw hosts of the Wicked One; and it beheld those hosts that they placed a weight on its weariness—error and accusation, and the spirit of deceiving. And when they came unto it, they said: “O soul, whither wilt thou flee? O miserable soul, stop, that we may see if there is anything of ours.” And when they saw it, they rejoiced and said: “Yes, yes, there is in thee, and thou art altogether ours; now we know that even thine angel cannot help thee and save thee out of our hand.” And the angel answered and said: “Know ye that it is a soul of the Lord, and he will not cast it aside; neither will I surrender the image of God into the hand of the Wicked One. The Lord supported me, all the days of the life of this soul, and he can support me and help me, and I will not cast it off until it go up before the throne of God on high. When he shall see it, he hath power over it, and will send it whither he pleases.”

And when these things took place, behold, a voice was heard from heaven, saying thus: “Bring up that soul, which despised the word of the living God.” And when it entered heaven, the ranks of angels saw it; they all exclaimed, with one voice, and said: “Woe unto thee, O miserable soul! what answer hast thou for thy works? or how wilt thou render to the living God an answer for thine iniquity? Woe unto thee! when the angels worship him, what will be thy answer unto him who poured out upon thee his mercies—upon thee, by night and by day!”

And the angel of that soul answered and said: “All ye, my friends, ask, pray, and beseech God, that this soul may be taken from us, and from our midst; for, lo, we are tormented by the stench of its odour. For ye perceive that from the time it came in among us, the odour of its stench hath passed upon all of us.” And those angels who were with the angel of that soul, made supplication; and afterward it ascended to heaven. Then they brought it before the throne of God; and it worshipped before him. And the angel stood in fear before God, and saying: “O Lord God, merciful and compassionate, the just judge; thou, O Lord, knowest this miserable soul; I am its angel, who performed for it service. I have been greatly distressed by the side of it. Do unto it, O Lord, according to thy mercies, and thy just judgments.”

Thus also said the Spirit of God: “I am the Spirit of Life, who have been with it and dwelt in it. I found in it no rest. Thou knowest, O Lord, that it hath afflicted me, and distressed me; and not in the least hath it remembered thy command-

ments, O Lord, even for one hour. Do unto it, O Lord, according to thy just judgments."

And lo! a voice, saying: "Where are thy fruits that I gave unto thee, that thou shouldst eat and take pleasure? Have I placed a difference between thee and the righteous? Have I not caused the sun to rise on them and on thee?" And its mouth was stopped, and it had no answer. Then I heard another voice, saying: "Just, O Lord, and right are thy judgments; and there is in them no partiality; for as for every one who hath practised mercy, the mercy he hath practised will be shewn unto him in the day of judgment." And afterward, there went forth a command against that miserable soul, that it should be delivered unto the angel which was stationed over torment, and that he should carry it into outer darkness; that it might be tormented there, until it return to its house, in the resurrection; and then, it and its body should receive torment together, as they sinned here.

Again, I heard a voice which said: "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and very right are thy judgments." And when they brought that soul, it wept and said: "O God, merciful, and just, and righteous, and right, in all thy works; there are seven days since I departed from my body; and I have been delivered to angels, and they have carried me to dreadful places, and there tormented me, these days." And a voice came unto it, saying: "If thou hadst practised mercy, mercy would have been unto thee. On this account, the day thou wast carried off, there was no mercy for thee." And that miserable soul said: "I have not sinned, O Lord!" Then anger burned against that soul; and the just judge went forth and said: "O angel of this soul, come and make known all its works." And he stood in great fear; and the angel held in his hand the like of a writing, and said: "Behold the sins of this soul in my hand, from the day it was fourteen years old until this day." And behold, a voice, saying: "Unto thee I say, O miserable soul, if thou hadst repented before thy death, I would not have remembered even one of thy sins: if thou hadst repented three months, or three days, before now, I would not have remembered even one of thy sins; and now I swear by my angels, and by the strength of my arm, if one hour before thy death thou hadst repented, I would have received thee. But order that the angel of such and such a soul come, and bring hither the souls with them." And in the same hour [immediately] they stood before God; and that soul recognized those souls against whom it had sinned. And lo, a voice saying: "Lofty and fearful one, behold thy servants standing before thy majesty." Then that soul said:

"This soul hath not ceased, and sleep hath not entered its eyes, until it killed that soul; and it shed blood upon the earth; and with another soul it committed adultery, and then it committed the sin of abortion upon it."

Then said the judge: "Thou knowest, O miserable soul, that as for every one who committeth wrong on a companion, if he dies first, I keep him until his murderer, and his enemy, come; then they will stand before the just judge; and every man will be rewarded according to his works." And God commanded that that soul be committed to the hand of the angel for the lowest Tartaros, and there be tormented until the resurrection.

And when these things took place, I heard a voice, saying: "Just and right is the judgment of God;" and again was there another voice of myriads of angels praising God, and saying: "Righteous art thou, O Lord, and very right are thy judgments; and there is no partiality with thee."

Then said unto me the angel who was with me: "Dost thou see all these, Paul?" and I said unto him: "I see, O my Lord." And he said unto me: "Follow me, and I will shew thee the place of the righteous." And I followed the angel, and he took me, and caused me to fly, and carried me up to the third heaven. Then he placed me at a door; and I looked upon the door, and saw the likeness of fine gold; and before it two posts, like adamant; and two tablets of gold above them; and they were full of writings. And the angel who was with me turned and said unto me: "Do not fear, Paul, to enter this door; for every man is not permitted—only those in whom there is great purity, and in whom evil dwells not." And I inquired of the angel who was with me, and said unto him: "Why are these writings inscribed on those tablets?" and he answered and said unto me: "These are the names of the righteous, as our Lord said to his disciples: 'Rejoice not that devils are subject unto you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.' These are they who praise God with all their hearts, and on earth are sojourners." I inquired of him: "O my Lord, are their names written while they are on earth?" and he answered and said unto me: "Yes; not only are their names written, but their works from day to day: the angel, their minister, brings tidings of their works, every day, from morning to morning; they are known to God by their hearts and their works. And after they are recorded, if there happen to them a matter of sin, or deficiency, it is purified by chastisement, according to their sin; that there be not unto them any defect in their strivings. They are known through the angel who performed for them service before they had departed from the world."

And when we entered within through the gate into the city, there came forth an angel unto us, whose face was shining like the sun ; and he embraced me, and kissed me, and said : " Peace be unto thee, O beloved of our Lord ;" and he manifested unto me a face of love. Then he groaned, and was sad and wept ; and I said : " O my Lord, why weepest thou ?" and he groaned, and said unto me : " Yes, master, to weep is needful for me, and to be sad, about the race of the sons of men ; for many and great are the good things and blessings which God has made ready for them ; and so great also are the promises which he desires to grant them ; but they cut themselves off, and know not, and keep not the commandments of our Lord ; and all of them are not worthy of those boons and blessings."

And I said to the angel who was with me : " Who is this, master ?" " This is Enoch, the scribe of righteousness." Then I entered within that place ; and I beheld there great Elijah coming toward us ; and he drew near and gave me a salutation, rejoicing and delighted. Then he turned and wept ; and he said unto me : " Art thou Paul ? Thou shalt receive the reward of thy toils and thy teachings which thou hast done laboriously for mankind, and turned them unto life. Behold, O my son, Paul, how great are the promises of God and his blessings ! a few only of men deserve them, a very few of mankind ; for few are they who enter these places which thou beholdest."

And the angel who was with me answered and said unto me : " Whatever I shew thee in this place, reveal not on earth unto the sons of men ; for flesh and blood understand not the life which is after the resurrection ; but after the resurrection they shall know." And I saw there things unutterable by a tongue of flesh. And I looked upon that land, and I saw that there was in it a river of water, and it had on its margins trees planted ; on this side and on that side ; and every one brings forth fruits, once every month ; and these fruits are formed in all likenesses. And I saw there, in the east of that place, that it is the most desirable of all the creations of the living God ; and that land was very light ; and in it were trees of life, and they were full of fruit, from their root to their top.

And the angel who was with me answered and said unto me : " See these, O my son ; God hath made ready these for those who are worthy of them." And again he said unto me : " These are the promises which God hath promised to his saints ; and know thou that there are seven times more than these—those which eye hath not seen nor ear heard ; nor into the heart of a mortal have they entered. And behold, I say unto thee, Paul, concerning the holy men who have departed out of the world,

and have seen these promises, which God hath made ready, that those same groaned and said: 'Why did such a word escape from our mouth?' and they were meditating on some small word, why they had uttered it." And I saw men there rejoicing, and exalting and praising the Creator; and I inquired of him: "Who are these, master?" and he said unto me: "These were men who were married in the world, and preserved their union, as God said unto them, and kept his commandments; and their bed was pure; and, behold, they have delight, and rejoice for ever and ever. But as for virgins, and those who were persecuted from the world, and hungered and thirsted for righteousness, God shall give unto them blessings more than these, O son. And behold, I shew unto thee, O Paul."

And after these things, he carried me to the eastward of that place; and I saw there a river of water, and its waters were white, more so than milk; and he said unto me: "Dost thou see these, Paul?" and I said to the angel: "What are these, O my Lord?" and he said to me: "This is the sea of the Eucharista [oblation]. To the east of this sea is the city of Christ; and not every man is permitted to enter that city—that is the way with the men who have committed adultery and wickedness, and kept not his commandments; they will not enter into it. But if a man turn from them, and repent of his iniquity before his death, just when he departs from earth, the angels bring him, and he worships before the throne of God, and he has the mark of repentance. And he is committed unto Michael, the chief of the angels, who conducts him over this sea of Eucharista, and introduces him to the city of Christ, and he is joined with those who sinned not." And I gave praise for what I saw.

And the angel who was with me answered and said unto me: "Come with me, and I will introduce thee into the city." And while I was standing by that sea of joy, he brought me unto a ship; and he placed me in it, and it resembled pure gold. And I saw a multitude of angels, more than three thousand, praising and singing, and raising hallelujahs before me, until I arrived at the city of Christ. And those who dwell in it, when they saw me, rejoiced with great joy, and came out unto me, and escorted me in. And when I went within that city, there was there a great river; and that city was light, seven times more than the sun; and it had seven walls round about it, and twelve thousand strong towers within it; and between them, every one, was a furlong; and I said to the angel who was with me: "What are these, O my Lord?" and he said unto me: "These are the towers which separate between the sons of men."

And when I beheld, I wondered, and was astonished at the

glory of that country. Afterwards, I saw the gates open in that part, and adorned with everything comely. And there were four rivers round about it: one on the east, and one on the west, and one on the north, and one on the south; and I said unto the angel who was with me: "What are these rivers, O my Lord?" and he said unto me: "These four rivers are the likeness of those which are on earth: Gihon, and Pison, and Euphrates, and Tigris."

And I saw within the gates of that city great trees, which were very high: they had no fruits, but only leaves; and I saw a few men dwelling in the midst of those trees, who wept very much whenever a just man entered into the city; and they themselves were bowed down and tormented; and when I saw them, I wept, and said unto the angel who was with me; "Who are these, who were not worthy to enter into the city?" and the angel said unto me: "It is more suitable for us to weep for these than for any men;" and I answered and said: "Wherefore, my Lord?" and the angel said unto me: "These were mourners and fasters, and they were occupied in prayer; but their heart was lofty before God, and they could not offer even one homage. Their heart was strong, and they supposed their business was going on well: they had not heard that God is opposed to the lofty, and giveth grace to the humble. And know thou, O Paul, that, more than all men, they praised themselves, and they gave to no man any salutation. To whom they pleased, they opened the door; but him to whom, for God's sake, it was necessary to open, on account of his being a stranger, they buffeted. This their high-mindedness hath prevented their entering in here. The Lord of glory, who was reviled by a cruel people, how did he bear all this, for the sake of the turning of one sheep, that it might not perish! They knew how they ought to do—I declare unto thee, Paul, that these have taken more pains than all the saints; but their loftiness was not bowed. This is the cause that prevented them from entering within."

After I passed from thence, I was going along with the angel; and he carried me up over a river; and I saw there the prophet Isaiah, and with him Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and Moses, and all the line of the prophets; they rose and inquired after my health; and I said to the angel who was with me: "What place is this?" and he answered and said unto me: "This is the place of the prophets, and of those who distressed their souls for God. When these depart from the world, they are carried to worship before God; then they are committed to Michael, the chief of the angels; and they are introduced into the city



of the prophets; and these inquire after their health, as of brethren; and they love them, because they have done the will of God; and they are all in the same enjoyment."

Then he carried me to the south of the city, and I saw there infants—those whom Herod killed; and they also rose and inquired after my health. And the angel who was with me answered and said unto me: "Whoever has kept his virgin, and the purity of his soul, he, when he departeth from the world, worships before the throne of God; and he is committed to Michael, the chief of the angels, who brings him to these infants, and they inquire after his health, as of a father."

Then he brought me to the east of the city, and I saw there honourable old men; and the just patriarchs, Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; and the whole bands of righteous ones; and they inquired after my health with joy; and I said to the angel who was with me: "Who are these, O my Lord?" and he answered and said unto me: "Every one who loveth strangers, and sheweth mercy unto the sons of men, when he departs from the world, and worships before God, by this road he goes in unto these saints, and is joined with them in this city; and they inquire after his health, and also love him, because he loved strangers like them; and they introduce him into the promised land."

And he brought me to the north of the city; and I saw there sons of men who were rejoicing, and exulting, and taking delight; and I said to the angel who was with me: "Who are these, my Lord?" and he said: "These are they who devoted themselves unto God with all their heart, and entered this place without fear."

And again he brought to the midst of the city; and there were within it twelve walls which were very high; and I inquired of the angel who was with me, and said: "O my Lord, is there yet any other place more than [superior to] these?" and he said unto me: "Each one is more glorious than the other, from the first even unto the twelfth. All men, according to their works, are cut off by one of these walls; and every one, according to his evil deeds, is cut off, by these walls, from one even unto twelve, from the sight of God."

Again he brought me to the middle of the city, and I saw thrones overspread, and robes and crowns placed over them, such that a man can not narrate the excess of their beauty; and I said to the angel who was with me: "For whom are these, my Lord?" and he said, "For those who in simplicity are reconciled with God, and who said in regard to themselves: 'We are low and despised;' and accounted not themselves anything.

Now, they have the things thou beholdest. These did not know books, nor any other thing; but daily they gave peace to [saluted] each other for the love of Christ. Some learned ones, how do they talk in their boasting! thou beholdest these ignorant ones, who did not know anything, how they were worthy of all this glory."

And I saw in the centre of the city a great altar, which was very high; and I saw standing on the side of the altar an aged man, great and honoured, and his face shone as the sun in the firmament; and he held in his hand a harp, and said: "Hallelujah;" and the whole city was astonished at his voice; and together they shouted—those that were above the towers, and all said: "Hallelujah." And when I saw these things, the foundations of the city were shaken with their shouting. Then I inquired of the angel who was with me: "What is this voice which shakes the city and all its inhabitants?" and the angel said unto me: "This is David, the king and prophet, who sings in the Jerusalem of Christ. As he sang on earth, so sings here David, in spirit, and all the saints are engaged with him, with the voice of shouting; and David the prophet goes forth singing, first, while all the saints after him respond: "Hallelujah."

And I said to the angel who was with me: "Why does David sing before this altar, and these saints respond, each in his own place?" and the angel answered and said unto me: "When Christ, the Son of God, ascended on high, and sat down on the right hand of his Father, this David sang alone, before his ascension, and said thus: 'Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors, that the king of glory may come in.' Many men longed for the singing of that time; but, save that man, none reached it. Again, a man hath not permission on earth to offer up sacrifice [celebrate the sacrament], without offering praise in it with the songs of the blessed David. Without the praise of David, a man presumes not to offer: it is necessary that he sing his songs at the time of offering; for it is the body of Christ."

And I said to him: "O my Lord, what is the meaning of Hallelujah?" and he said unto me: "How much thou examinest, and askest questions, Paul! Whatever thou desirest to know, know. Hallelujah, in the language of the Hebrews, means, 'Praise the Lord.' Praise God, who was the first of all. Unto him do the angels, without ceasing, raise Hallelujah, and praise him who sent for us salvation, and created for us all things."

And I said unto him: "O my Lord, then every one who says 'Hallelujah' praises God?" and the angel said unto me: "If a

man sing in the assembly, and those who are near him do not respond 'Hallelujah,' they sin. If those men do not respond, the angels will certainly respond; and if a man is sick or old, and does not respond, the guardian angel responds in his stead. But I declare that every one who is strong, and doth not respond—what do they say of him? 'This proud devil turneth aside; if he despises one response, does he not know that he despises to offer up an offering to God? he does not prize converse with God; for as much as a man offers prayers, he speaks with God; and he who prays not cuts himself off from converse with God.'"

After these things, he led me out without the city, and brought me to the midst of those trees of the Eucharista, and the angel said unto me: "This is the land of promise; it is all the delight of the saints."

Then he lifted me up, and carried me above the rivers of the sea, and raised me above the sea of the ocean, which sustains the firmament of the lower heaven; and the angel answered and said unto me: "Dost thou know whither thou art going, Paul?" and I said: "I do not know, my Lord;" and he said: "Follow me, and I will shew thee the place in which the souls of sinners and wicked ones are tormented."

And he brought me toward the setting of the sun; and I saw there the end of heaven, made firm on a great river; and I asked him: "Which lower deep is this, my Lord?" and he said unto me: "This is the sea of the ocean which surrounds the whole earth, and the earth is within it."

And I saw there coals of fire placed in order, and a flame of fire proceeding from them; and many men are sunk in it; some of them up to the belly, and some to the lips, and some to the head—and they in the fire; and I inquired of the angel: "What are these, my Lord?" and he said: "These made [reckoned] themselves not on a level with the righteous, and not with the wicked: they did not receive [experience] repentance, but filled up their life in error, and in serving their body, and did everything in fornication and great sins. They never gave themselves to repentance, and remembered not their end; and when they died, they came here." And I said to the angel who was with me: "Who are those who sink to their knees in the fire?" and he said unto me: "These, when they go out of the church, and have finished prayer, speak idle words, and desire that men should listen unto them; and they raise their voice above their companions."

Then I said to him: "Who are these that sink to their belly in the fire?" and he answered and said unto me: "Then, when they partook of the body of our Lord, would commit adultery

and fornication; and kept not their body for the honour of their Lord, and restrained not themselves from wantonness until they died. And those who sink up to the lips are those who sang in the church at all times, and incited each other; but by tricks and by dissembled love they deceived their companions."

Afterwards I saw there, at the setting of the sun, many torments, of various kinds, and full of men and women; and a river of fire flowed forth from among them, and they suffered bitter torments.

And I saw there deep abysses, and in them many souls fallen upon each other. The depth of that river was thirty cubits and more. And they wept and groaned, while they said, all together: "Lord! have mercy upon us, O Lord God!" and yet there was no mercy upon them.

And I inquired of the angel who was with me: "Who are these?" and he answered and said unto me: "These are they who hoped in God, that he might be a helper; but they were at rest on their wealth." And I inquired: "O my Lord, from what time are they here?" and he said unto me: "From ten ages; and still longer will they remain here, age upon age, in this torment. And this abyss has no measure; and it boils more than a cauldron, as you behold."

Then I looked, and saw, and behold, another deep, which was deeper than the first; and there were in it souls of the wicked. It was so deep that, when souls were cast into it, they would hardly reach the bottom of that deep in a hundred years.

And I, Paul, when I saw these things, wept over the human kind, that there was so much torment for them. And the angel answered and said unto me: "Wherefore dost thou weep? why! art thou more merciful than God?" and I said: "God forbid, O my Lord; for God is good, and long-suffering unto the sons of men; and he leaves every one of them to his own will; and he [man] walks as he pleases."

And I looked again, and saw a river, which was more terrific [sharper] than the other river. And the angels were bearing off an old man, and they sunk him in the river up to the knees. And there came a minister from the angels, and he held in his hand an iron pitchfork, and it had three tines, and they were extracting the entrails of that old man from the mouth. Then I said to the angel who was with me: "What are these torments with which they are tormenting this one? and how bitter they are!" and the angel said unto me: "This was a priest, and he did not fulfil his ministry as he ought. He ceased not from committing adultery every day. He ate, and drank, and

committed fornication; and the rule of his office he did not fulfil—no, not for a single day.”

Again I looked, and saw another old man, whom four angels were carrying off in a severe manner, and at a rapid run, and they sunk him up to the knees in that river of fire; and they allowed him not to say: “Lord, have mercy upon me;” but tormented him with rigour. And I said to the angel who was with me: “Who is this, O my Lord?” and he said unto me: “O my son, this was a bishop; and he did not pasture well his flock, but made for himself a name in eating, and drinking, and pleasures; and he remembered not the grace by which I set him over it, and accounted him worthy of the great work, that he should be a shepherd; and he did not judge one righteous judgment, nor had he mercy on the orphans and the widows.”

And I saw there another man, sunk up to his chin; and he wallowed in blood, and worms were coming out of his mouth; and he was weeping in bitterness, and he was crying out and saying: “O Lord, have mercy upon me;” and this torment was more severe than all the other torments. And I said to the angel who was with me: “Who is this, my Lord?” And he said unto me: “This was a deacon; and he was wont to eat the sacrament, not according to rule, but with the gluttony of bread; and he did nothing good before God, a single day, but committed adultery. Therefore they shew no mercy unto him, and his torments also are without mercy.”

Again, I saw a man in severe distress; and they cast him into the river of fire. And there came to him an angel, one who presided over the torments; and he held in his hand pincers of fire, very sharp; and he was cutting off the lips of that man, little by little. And when I beheld, I, Paul, wept; and I said unto the angel who was with me: “What has this one done?” and he said unto me: “This one was a reader and a teacher in the world, but he would not himself keep one of the words which he taught; and he died, and had not repented. For this reason they torment him.”

Again, I saw another place in which there was devouring fire, and a worm; and many men and women were cast into it; and that worm was gnawing and devouring without mercy. And I said to the angel: “Who are these, my Lord?” and he said unto me: “Dost thou see, Paul? These are those who took usury, and placed their hope in their riches, and trusted not in the Lord, that he should be unto them a Saviour; and they died without repentance, and came to this dreadful and bitter torment.”

And again he shewed unto me a very distressing [narrow] place, and more severe than the former one; for there were there men and women gnawing their tongues. And I said unto the angel who was with me: "Who are these, my Lord?" and he said: "These are they who whispered together in church, in the time of the service of the holy ordinances, and listened not to the words of God, but talked idle words; and who forsook the converse with God; and they died without repentance."

And again, I saw another deep, from which issue forth torments; and I saw in it men and women tormented without mercy; some of them up to their lips, and some up to [the top of] their head. And I said to the angel: "What are these?" and he said unto me: "These are witches and wizards, who ceased not from their sorceries, till they departed out of the world." And I saw again, over on the other side of them, bitter darkness, and there were in it men whose cry rose up unceasingly; and they were crying out and saying: "O Lord, have mercy on us, for now we have known the time of repentance." And those angels yet the more tormented them, saying: "There is no place for repentance. Had you repented before death, you might perhaps have been accepted." And I, Paul, groaned and wept; and I said: "Woe unto you, O wicked ones! wherefore were you born into the world?" And he answered and said unto me: "It is more needful to weep for the patriarchs, and the metropolitans, and the bishops; and weep thou over priests, and over deacons; for they have all done iniquity; and yet more, over lovers of money. They loved the torments into which they have fallen, and shewed no mercy; and to them also no mercy comes, but they are tormented sevenfold; for they have lost the time of repentance. But God is merciful, who hath left every man to his own will; and they therefore deserve bitter torments."

And when I was weeping over these things, the angel said unto me: "Art thou crazy, Paul? As yet, thou hast not seen bitter torments." Then he carried me to the west, where all the torments were made ready; and he stationed me upon a well, and I saw that the well was sealed with three seals. And the angel who was with me answered and said unto me: "Paul, dost thou see this well?" Then he said to the angel who stood over the mouth of the well: "Open this well for Paul, beloved of our Lord; for our Lord hath given unto him permission that he should see both all the enjoyments and blessings of the righteous, and all the woes and torments of sinners." Then the angel answered and said unto us: "Then stand afar off, that the odour of the stench may not reach thee." And when he

opened the well, there came forth from it the odour of much stench. And the angel who was with me said unto me, that as for every one who is cast into this well, there will be no remembrance of him, neither with God, nor with angels. And I said to the angel who was with me: "My Lord, who are these that deserve this pit?" and he said unto me: "Those who do not confess Jesus Christ, nor his resurrection, nor his humanity, but consider him as all mortals [earthly ones], and who say that the sacrament of the body of our Lord is bread."

Then I looked to the west, and behold, heaven opened; and Michael, the chief of the angels, he who is over the covenant, descending from heaven, and a host of angels with him; and he came unto those who were in torments. They said unto him: "Have mercy on us; we know that thou didst always offer up supplication in our behalf, while we were in the world, and now the fearful judgment of God hath reached us." And the angel answered and said unto them: "Hearken, all ye who are in torments; by that Lord before whom I stand, I do not cease to weep on your account. Yet ye, O wicked ones, would not cease to sin, and ye filled up your life with vanity; and now, O ye wicked ones, where are your prayers, and where your repentance, that peradventure there should be unto you mercy?" And I, Paul, heard these things from Michael; and those wicked ones were weeping and crying, and their voice was like thunder. And I remembered the words which our Lord spake: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth." And the angels with me were crying out and saying: "O our Lord, have mercy on the work of thy hand [thy forming]; have mercy on thine image."

And when these things took place, I, Paul, stood confounded, and I saw the heavens shaking, like trees before the wind. And the gates were opened, and I saw our Lord coming with an escort on the clouds of heaven; and the odour of incense went forth before him, from the earth even unto his throne. And I saw twenty-four elders casting themselves down before God and making supplication. And the four winds of heaven worshipped and made supplication before God. And all the angels were crying out and speaking with them. And I heard the voice of our Lord, saying: "What do my glorious angels desire?" and the angels answered and said: "Plenitude of thy mercy unto the sons of men." Then all those who were in the torments lifted up their voice and said: "O Lord Jesus Christ, son of the living God, have mercy on the work of thy hands [thy forming, or moulding, as a potter]."

And I saw a throne, and before it were prophets, and, behind

them, apostles, and martyrs, and confessors; and every one of them in his order. And while I, Paul, was astonished at all this, I saw an old man standing by me; and he was beautiful in appearance; and an angel singing before him. And I inquired of the angel who was with me: "Who is this?" and he said unto me: "This is Moses, the founder of the divine laws." And he drew nigh unto me, and inquired after my health; and he was weeping. And I said unto him: "Wherefore weepest thou, master?" and he said: "I weep for the thing that I have planted in the world, and it hath not brought forth fruit; and all the great miracles which God wrought by my hands, they understood not; and they forsook not the worship of idols; and Israel turned not unto the Lord. I declare unto thee, O Paul, that in the hour the cruel ones crucified the Son of God, him who gave unto them laws, at the same time all the angels stood in sorrow, and all the righteous patriarchs did likewise; and the angels desired at once to destroy the crucifiers; but the command of the living God restrained them, that he might fulfil the words of the prophets. But the patriarchs were all looking at me, and saying unto me: 'See, the sons of thy people, what have they done to the Son of God?' Therefore I say unto thee, O Paul, blessed art thou, and blessed is the generation of which thou art a minister; and they do not know to what a boon thou dost invite them."

And while he was talking, there came unto me twelve others, saying unto me: "Art thou Paul, who was called Saul? We have heard before God a good remembrance of thee." Then I said: "Who are ye, my masters? tell me." The first one answered and said: "I am Isaiah, the distinguished prophet; and Manasseh, the son of Hezekiah, sawed me through with a wood-saw." And another answered and said: "I am Ezekiel, the son of Buzi, he whom the Jews dragged on the mountain until the brains of my head went out. And all of us, my son, died in this way; and not one of us by a natural death. God constrained us, that we should turn Israel; and every one of us, in some way, they tormented. O Paul, blessed is the people that repents through thee; and blessed is the generation whose minister thou art." And one of them answered and said unto me: "My son, I received angels into my house as strangers, and the sons of the city came to take them away from me by force, for wantonness; and I gave them my two daughters, who were virgins, and said unto them: 'Do unto them as you please; lo, the two know not a man, and to these men do no wickedness;' and they listened not unto me. And lo, thou seest, Paul, that every evil-doer is thus rewarded."



And after these things I saw there, coming towards me, another old man, whose face and looks shone very brightly, like an angel; and his angel before him, singing and praising. And I said to the angel who was with me: "Then, my master, as for every one of the saints, the angel who guideth him in the world is here with him praising; and wherever he goeth, he walketh before him; and the angels and saints have a love that cannot be divided. From the day that they do the will of God, they do not separate from them; and in every place where they sojourn, the praise of the Lord is in their mouth."

Then I inquired of the angel who was with me: "Who is this old man, master?" and he said unto me: "This is righteous Job." And he drew nigh unto me, and gave me a salutation, and said unto me: "Paul, thine honour and remembrance are always with God, and among all the saints. And I am Job, who endured many temptations from Satan. Thirty years he [God] left me, until I fell, prostrated and smitten with evil boils. Worms swarmed upon me, and every one of them about three fingers [in length]. And Satan daily uttered threats over me, saying: 'Curse thy God and die.' And when he prompted my sons with me to come and comfort me, then Satan would say with their tongue: 'How much Job suffers these torments, and the plague of boils!' And every day he urged them to say to me: 'Blaspheme against the living God and die!' But I yielded not to the desire of the Wicked One, but always said: 'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be his name.' It were better for me that I should remain under the scourge with which I was so much distressed, all the days of my life, than that I should blaspheme against God. And I would not cease from blessing his name; and he was long-suffering unto me in all that distress, for whom everything is easy; for what is the affliction of this world, compared with the promises of God, which he has prepared for his called, and those who delight in his love?"

And I saw another old man, saying unto me: "Peace be unto thee, O Paul." And I said unto the angel who was with me: "Who is this old man, my master?" And he himself said to me: "I am Noah, of the ark of the flood. I was six hundred years old when I was building the ark for all flesh; and I ceased not to tell the sons of men: 'Repent of your evil deeds, for behold a flood cometh, and it will destroy you.'" And they saw that I prayed by night and day for them; bread I ate not in quietness, and the hair of my head I shaved not; and I hoped that, peradventure, God would shew mercy unto the work

of his hands, and not destroy it. But they repented not, and considered not."

And after these things, I saw two coming unto me; and the angel who was with me said unto me: "These are Elijah and Elisha." And they came unto me, and inquired after my health; and Elijah said unto me, while rejoicing with me: "I prayed before God concerning the people of Israel, and it rained not upon them rain for three years and six months; for their iniquity was great. I spake unto them, and they would not hear me. And I remembered that whatever a man asks, the Lord granteth it unto him; as David, the prophet, hath said: "The Lord is nigh unto those who call upon him in truth; and he performeth the will of them that fear him.' And often the angels asked that he would give them rain, and he gave not, until I called upon him again; then he gave unto them. But blessed art thou, O Paul, that thy generation, and those thou teachest [thy teaching], are the sons of the kingdom. And know thou, O Paul, that every man who believes through thee hath a great blessing, and a blessing is reserved for him." Then he departed from me.

And the angel who was with me led me forth, and said unto me: "Lo, unto thee is given this mystery and revelation; as thou pleasest, make it known unto the sons of men." And I, Paul, returned unto myself, and I knew all that I had seen; and in life I had not rest that I might reveal this mystery; but I wrote it, and deposited it under the ground and the foundation of the house of a certain faithful man, with whom I used to be, in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia. And when I was released from this life of time, and stood before my Lord, thus said he unto me: "Paul, have we shewn all these things unto thee, that thou shouldst deposit them under the foundation of a house? Then send, and disclose, concerning this Revelation, that men may read it, and turn to the way of truth, that they also may not come to these bitter torments."

And thus was this Revelation discovered. When this Paul, the apostle, was in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia, in the house of an honourable man, the angel of the Lord appeared in a dream unto that man, and said unto him: "Destroy the foundation of this house, and the thing thou findest, take." And the man did not understand; he thought that it was a lying dream, and paid no attention. And again, he returned to him the second time, and urged him, saying: "I say unto thee, O man, pull down all the foundation of this house, and see everything that thou findest in it; take it and make it known unto the sons of men, that they may turn from the evil way unto life." Then that man arose in wrath, and pulled down the building, and dug up the foundation,

and found a box of white glass, and in it was that which the saint saw and wrote—namely, Paul, the apostle, the blessed and divine, with his stockings placed by the side of this Revelation—these stockings he used to wear on his feet at the time of prayer—and his cloak folded up, with this Revelation. When he found them, he brought them unto a judge, thinking that there was something of gold within it. And he carried it, still sealed, to king Theodosius; and that faithful and righteous king opened it, and he saw thus inscribed: “Unto you I say, O sinners, for your sake God descended from heaven, and took a body from the Holy Ghost, and was hung upon a tree, that he might make you free from sin. And I sent unto you my just and righteous servants, that ye might turn unto the way of truth; but some of them ye killed, and some of them ye stoned, while they were preaching unto you the truth. But ye believed not all these. And I gave unto you a sacrament [mystery] for the repentance of life, and ye repented not. Now, understand and behold this Revelation: and repent of your wicked ways, and of everything which is hateful in the world. Now ye see the torments which are recorded in this Revelation; and every one who turneth not to the way of repentance shall be thus tormented. Hitherto ye have said: ‘We have not known.’ Now, behold, ye see everything which is recorded.”

Thus Christ gave this vision unto the great and blessed apostle Paul; who, so long as he was in the world, taught and preached; and now also, in this Revelation, He hath made known unto him that the sons of men should turn through him; after his death, by this Revelation should they be instructed.

Be astonished, O my beloved, at this man of wonders! How much he loved his Lord! And he concealed not from him even one thing of what took place; not in regard to the righteous, nor in regard to the wicked.

This is the last Testament which our Lord sent to the world<sup>b</sup> [by the hand of the father of the Gentiles, Paul the great preacher and blessed Apostle. Woe to every one who meets

---

<sup>b</sup> The remainder of the translation, enclosed within brackets, is made by Dr. A. H. Wright, missionary at Orûmiah, at present on a visit in this country. Its text is not now found in the original manuscript (the last leaf of which has become lost or destroyed), but we possess it in a modern copy made from this at Orûmiah, just before the work was first sent to America. The copy is a good deal defaced in places, by the dampening of the ink, and consequent adhesion of the leaves, and Dr. Wright's version is at one or two illegible points partly conjectural, although doubtless in the main correct. We have also to thank Dr. Wright for collating with the original text the whole version of the Revelation, as it has been going through the press.

with it and does not truly understand what is signified by it: he shall have no part in the blessings of the just.

But every one that turneth from the evil way, and places these warnings before his eyes, will not be allowed to sin, and, if he sins and repents, his repentance will be accepted.

My brethren, stir up your minds, and see how many blessings and joys those have who do the will of God, and how many sorrows attach to the wicked. Do not transgress in any small word, for our Lord says, in the Gospel, that for every idle word which men shall speak they shall give account in the day of judgment. So order your ways that no idle words may escape from your lips, and be an occasion of stumbling to you.]

---

*The sublime Contemplations of a Holy Soul.*—But that lofty soul that bears about with it the living apprehension of its being made for an everlasting state, so earnestly intends it, that it shall ever be a descent and vouchsafement with it, if it allow itself to take notice what busy mortals are doing in their (as they reckon them) grand negotiations here below. And if there be a suspicion of an aptness, or inclination to intermeddle in them to their prejudice, to whom that part belongs, can heartily say to it, (as the philosopher to the jealous tyrant,) We of this academy are not at leisure to mind things so mean: we have somewhat else to do than to talk of you. He hath still the image before his eye, of this world vanishing and passing away: of the other, with the everlasting affairs and concerns of it, even now ready to take place, and fill up all the stage; and can represent to himself the vision not from a melancholic fancy, or crazed brain, but a rational faith, and a sober well-instructed mind, of the world, dissolving monarchies and kingdoms breaking up, thrones tumbling, crowns and sceptres lying as neglected things. He hath a telescope, through which he can behold the glorious appearances of the Supreme Judge; the solemn state of his majestic person; the splendid pomp of his magnificent and vastly numerous retinue; the obsequious throng of glorious celestial creatures, doing homage to their eternal King; the swift flight of his royal guards, sent forth into the four winds to gather the elect, and covering the face of the heavens with their spreading wings; the universal silent attention of all to that loud sounding trumpet that shakes the pillars of the world, pierces the inward caverns of the earth, and resounds from every part of the encircling heavens; the many myriads of joyful expectants arising, changing, putting on glory, taking wings and contending upwards, to join themselves to the triumphant heavenly host; the judgment set; the books opened; the frightful amazed looks of surprised wretches; the equal administration of the final judgment; the adjudication of all to their eternal states; the heavens rolled up as a scroll; the earth and all things therein consumed and burnt up.—*Howe.*

**THE METONIC CYCLE AND CALIPPIC PERIOD.**

IN p. 424 of your Number for January last, Dr. Hincks says, "The Peloponnesian war began two months before the close of the archonship of Pythodorus, as is expressly stated by Thucydides at the beginning of the second book of his history. He is followed by Diodorus, who in his annals mentions, under that archonship, that the war began by the battle and siege of Potidæa, and that the history of Thucydides then began. Now Thucydides mentions in chap. xxviii. of his second book that in that summer there was an eclipse of the sun; and it is certain from astronomical calculations that there was one, which must have been visible at Athens, on the 3rd August, 431, the year in the summer of which, according to Diodorus, Pythodorus was succeeded by Euthydemus. At the commencement of the seventh summer after this, according to Thucydides (book iv., chap. lii.), the sun was again eclipsed, and calculations give the date of the eclipse 21st March, 424. Again in the nineteenth year of the war there was a total eclipse of the moon, just before Nicias was to sail from Sicily; his superstitious dread of which leading to disastrous consequences, caused it to be noted not only by Thucydides (book vii., chap. 1), but by Diodorus (book xiii., chap. ii.). This eclipse is calculated to have occurred 27th August, 413, and to have been total. I need scarcely say that no such series of eclipses could have occurred twenty-one years before the dates I have given, or any other number of years before or after them that Mr. Parker may be pleased to fancy. 10. But this is not all. The year in which the Peloponnesian war broke out—the year in which Pythodorus was archon—is remarkable as the first year of the Metonic cycle, and the year in which the adoption of this cycle was published at the Olympic games, which began on the eleventh day of the year. The time when this cycle began must have been a matter of public notoriety. The year of the cycle was made generally known by the appearance, in a conspicuous position at Athens, of its number formed in gold; and the omission from the calendar of every sixty-third day, counted from the beginning of the cycle, must have rendered it absolutely impossible for any mistake, or any difference of opinion, as to the time when it begun to have existed. Now all are agreed that the Metonic cycle dates from the 16th July, 432. Its first year was the first year of the eighty-seventh Olympiad; and it is here that Diodorus places the archonship of Pythodorus, the successor of Apseudes, under whom Meton's cycle was adopted by the Athenians. It would

be idle to pretend that the year which began in 432 might be the first year of the second Metonic cycle, when the intercalary months and exemptile days would be in the same places as in the first year of the first cycle. The latter period would in that case begin in 451; and in that year there were no Olympic games at which the cycle could be published. In order to reach another year which should have the two characteristics of being the first of an Olympiad and the first of a Metonic cycle, it would be necessary to go back seventy-six years, to 508 B.C."

In p. 411 of your Number for July last, Dr. Hincks says: "The archon before Pythodorus was Apseudes. In his archonship, Meton, having discovered the cycle of nineteen years which bears his name, procured a law at Athens that his arrangement of the calendar, in respect to intercalary years and exemptile days, should *commence at the new moon following the summer solstice of that year*. Accordingly, the next year, when Pythodorus was archon, was the first year of the first Metonic cycle. It was also a year in which the Olympic games were celebrated, because the Metonic cycle was proclaimed at the games which immediately followed its commencement. The archonship of Pythodorus had, therefore, two characteristics; it was the first year of an Olympiad and the first year of a Metonic cycle. Now, it is notorious that the year which began in the summer of 432 had these two characteristics, and that neither that which began in 435, nor that which began in 453, had either the one or the other of them. Mr. Parker has not ventured to say a single word in reply to this argument, which I brought forward in my former paper, although it is *absolutely conclusive*."

In your p. 412, Dr. Hincks also says, "Again, Aristarchus (cited by Ptolemy in his *Almagest*, pp. 162, 163) says, that he observed the summer solstice at the end of the fiftieth year of the first Calippic period, being the forty-fourth year from the death of Alexander, that is, in June 280, as all must admit; and he says that this was one hundred and fifty-two years after the observation of the solstice by Meton in the archonship of Apseudes, in the morning of the 21st Phamenoth, that is, on the 27th June, 432. Mr. Parker, strangely enough, overlooks this testimony of a writer who lived nearer to the time of which he speaks than any of those whom he cites, and who had doubtless obtained the best evidence which was then available on the subject. If this evidence stood alone it would, in my judgment, outweigh all the evidence on which Mr. Parker relies."

Thus Dr. Hincks, like the Philistine giant of old, thinking soon to give my flesh to the fowls of the air and to the beasts of

the field, throws down his gauntlet in great disdain; but I confidently take upon myself to fight the battle of chronology upon the ground of the Metonic cycle, as connected with the Calippic period in 50 Cal. Per. I., and am quite willing to have the issue regarded as *absolutely conclusive*.

As I noticed in my last letter, it is not Aristarchus himself, but Hipparchus, who lived one hundred and fifty-two years after him, that Ptolemy cites, as his authority for the statement, that the observation of the summer solstice in 50 Cal. Per. I., was made one hundred and fifty-two years after the observation of the summer solstice by Meton in the archonship of Apseudes. Nor is it difficult to shew that this statement itself (at least as regards the year B.C. in which, according to Hipparchus, the observation must have been made by Aristarchus) is incredible.

Dr. H. rightly says that these one hundred and fifty-two years ended in June 280 B.C., according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy; but it must be clearly proved. In *lib.* iii. 8, Ptolemy says that from the reign of Nabonasar to the death of Alexander there were four hundred and twenty-four years. Hence by forty-four years after the death of Alexander, Ptolemy must mean E.N. 468. Further: in *lib.* v., 14, Ptolemy says that there was an eclipse of the moon the 17th of Phamenoth, E.N. 225, and by astronomical calculation this must have been 16th July, 523 B.C. Hence forty-four years after the death of Alexander, that is, E.N. 468, must have been B.C. 280, as given by Dr. H. (E.N. 468 having begun on 1st November, 281, and ended 31st October, 280). Hence the observation of the summer solstice by Meton in the archonship of Apseudes must have been in B.C. 432, that is, E.N. 316 (E.N. 316 having begun 9th December, 433 B.C., and ended 8th December, 432 B.C.)

Further: the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes must have been near the beginning, and not near the end of his archonship. This is placed beyond doubt by Thucydides and Ptolemy. The Peloponnesian war (as we have been reminded by Dr. H.) began two months before the close of the archonship of Pythodorus, as is expressly stated by Thucydides at the beginning of the second book of his history. Thucydides also says that it was in the beginning of spring. In his *lib.* v., 19, Thucydides also says that peace was made between the Athenians and Lacedæmonians on the 27th day of the month Artemisius, when Pleistolas was Ephorus, but at Athens Alcæus was archon, and it was on the 25th day of the month Elaphebolion, and in sec. 20, Thucydides says, "This peace was made in the very end of winter and the spring then beginning, presently after the city Bacchanals, and full ten years and some few days over, after

the first invasion of Attica and the beginning of this war." Thus the war must have began a few days before the 25th of Elaphebolion in the archonship of Pythodorus, and we have only to convert the 25th of Elaphebolion into its equivalent Julian date in order to ascertain when the archonship of Pythodorus ended. Now we learn from Ptolemy, l. vii., 3, that in E.N. 454 Timocharis made an observation of the moon on the 15th of Elaphebolion, on the 5th of Tybi, according to the Egyptians. In this year the Thoth, or first day of the Egyptian year, was the 5th of November, and therefore the 5th of Tybi must have been the 9th of March, and therefore the 25th of Elaphebolion must have been the 19th of March. Hence the Peloponnesian war must have began a few days before the 19th of March. Hence the archonship of Pythodorus must have ended a few days before the 19th day of May. Hence the archonship of Apseudes, his immediate predecessor, must also have ended a few days before the 19th of May. Hence the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes must have been near the beginning, and not near the end of his archonship, and therefore, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, the archonship must have began in B.C. 432. Thus the archonship of Apseudes and not the archonship of Pythodorus (as held by Dr. Hincks) must be regarded as the first year of the Metonic cycle.

Further: the eclipse of the sun, which, according to Dr. Hincks and the advocates of the common chronology, was the eclipse mentioned by Thucydides, as having been in the beginning of the summer of the eighth year of the war, occurred 21st March, 424. Hence Dr. Hincks is not at liberty to contend either that the war began later than 21st March, or that the archonship of either Pythodorus or Apseudes ended later than 21st of May.

To elucidate the subject it will be well to set forth in *Tables* the list of archons, which Diodorus has handed down from Apseudes to Agesias (the death of Alexander). See *Tables at the end of this paper*. *Table I.* sets forth the list with the dates, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy. In this *Table*, the eighth Metonic cycle, that is, one hundred and fifty-two years from the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes, ends with the end of 50 Cal. Per. I., at the summer solstice in B.C. 280. *Table II.* sets forth the list with the dates, according to Diodorus. In this *Table* the eighth Metonic cycle ends with the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I., at the summer solstice in B.C. 281. *Table III.* sets forth the list with the dates, according to my own chronology. In this *Table* the ninth Metonic cycle, that is, one hundred and seventy-one years from the summer solstice in



the archonship of Apseudes, ends with the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I., at the summer solstice in B.C. 282.

I will now turn to the archonship of Phanostratus and Menander. In your p. 410, for July, Dr. Hincks says, "The proof that Phanostratus and Menander commenced their archonships in 383 and 382 B.C. is a very simple one. There is a record of three eclipses which, from the description given of them, *must have occurred* on the 23rd December, 383, the 18th June, 382, and the 12th of December, 382. This record was copied by Ptolemy from Hipparchus, to whom it was transmitted by some ancient astronomer, who was probably an eyewitness of one at least of the eclipses. Now, the record states expressly that the first eclipse occurred in Posideon in the archonship of Phanostratus; the second in Scirrophorion in the same archonship; and the third in the former Posideon in the archonship of Evander; obviously the same person that Diodorus calls Menander. It is uncertain, and it is of no importance, which of the two readings of the name is correct. Here then is direct evidence of the most positive description in favour of the received chronology, from the archonship of Aristocrates downwards. Against this Mr. Parker can find nothing to say." In your p. 426 for January last, Dr. Hincks also says in reference to these same three eclipses, "Now, according to Diodorus, the archonship of Phanostratus began in the middle of July, 383, and that of his successor in the beginning of July, 382, so that the list of Diodorus is confirmed by a record which may be considered cotemporary; for, although Ptolemy says that the records of these eclipses were brought from Babylon, there are good grounds for thinking that he was misinformed as to the first of them; and that it was observed at Athens."

That the archonship of Phanostratus began in B.C. 383, and that of his successor in B.C. 382, according to Diodorus, is not to be denied; see my *Table II.*: but, as these archonships were respectively the fiftieth and the fifty-first from the archonship of Apseudes in the list of Diodorus, they must, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, as shewn in my *Table I.*, have begun not in B.C. 383, 382, but in B.C. 382, 381, and consequently the eclipse of 23rd of December, 383, could not have been in the archonship of Phanostratus: nor could the eclipse of 12th Dec., 382, have been in the archonship of Menander. Nor could the eclipse of the 18th of June, 382, have been in the archonship of Phanostratus, even if his archonship had begun in B.C. 383, as held by Diodorus. That these archonships began in July (as held by Dr. Hincks), is quite incredible after what we have learnt from Thucydides as to the end of the archonship of Pythodorus.

Further; Hipparchus says that these three eclipses were observed at and brought from Babylon; and surely it is quite incredible that an astronomer, observing and recording an eclipse at Babylon, should state in his record there that the eclipse had occurred in the archonship of an archon of Athens, and the finding that it is impossible that these eclipses could have occurred in the archonships in which they are placed by Ptolemy, should remove all doubt, but that the giving of these archonships, as their dates, must have been the work of some later and misguided hand, and therefore the eclipses are not to be regarded as any evidence of the dates of the archonships. Further; we have seen that Dr. Hincks himself does not place implicit reliance in all that Ptolemy has said in the matter, and in your p. 460 Dr. Hincks also says, in reference to the eclipse of the 23rd of December, 383:—

“Ptolemy says that Hipparchus said, that this was one of the eclipses observed at Babylon; but there is nothing in the record to indicate that; and the statement of a writer who lived two hundred years after the event ought not to be believed, when it is inconsistent with what the record implies. Ptolemy may have misunderstood Hipparchus, or Hipparchus may have misunderstood his authority, whatever that was. The record itself clearly points to Athens as the place of observation. It dates by the year of an Athenian archon, not by a regnal year of Artaxerxes; and it speaks of *seasonable* hours,—a mode of measuring time which was used at Athens and in Egypt, but not in Babylon. We have Babylonian records in existence, which prove that the astronomers of Babylon measured their time by *kazabs*, of two mean solar hours each, reckoned from noon to noon. Of the hours of the day and hours of the night they knew nothing. Besides, the hypothesis that Babylon was the place of observation, is at variance with the indisputable fact that the eclipse of the first of September, 720, was observed at Babylon. The records of the two eclipses are such, that it is quite impossible that both should have been observed at the same place: whereas the two observations are perfectly consistent, if the earlier one be referred to Babylon, and the later to Athens.”

For this important admission my best thanks are due to Dr. Hincks; for it greatly affects the historical character of the *Almagest*. But I must remind the doctor, that if the record dating by the year of an Athenian archon, not by a regnal year of Artaxerxes, and speaking of *seasonable* hours, be any evidence that the eighth eclipse was observed at Athens, it gives the same evidence of the ninth and tenth eclipses having also been observed at Athens; for the record employs the same terms in regard to each of them. Nor does Ptolemy employ the term *kazab* in reference to the eclipse of 1st September, 720, or to any other of the ten eclipses said to have been observed at Babylon. The inference from this would be, that the terms which

we now find in the *Almagest* have been substituted for others which were in the original records.

Thus Mr. Parker can find something to say against Dr. Hincks's direct evidence of the most positive description; and, if this be not enough to prove the unhistorical character of the *Almagest*, we will go to the archonship of Aristophanes. This, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, as seen in *Table I.*, must have begun in 112 Ol. 3, B.C. 330: but, according to Diodorus, in *Table II.*, this archonship was in 112 Ol. 2, and it is fixed by an eclipse of the moon, which took place about the time that Darius Codomanus, the last king of Persia, was conquered by Alexander at the battle of Arbela; and this eclipse has been calculated to have been 20th Sept., B.C. 331.

If this be not enough, we will turn to the date of the death of Alexander, as also affected by Hipparchus and Ptolemy, placing the beginning of the archonship of Apseudes in E.N. 316, i. e., 432, instead of in B.C. 433, where it is placed by Diodorus. Josephus, *Apion*, i. 22, says, "It is agreed by all that Alexander died in the 114th Olympiad." Arrian, *Exped. Alex.*, vii. 167, says, "Alexander died in the 114th Olympiad, when Agesias was archon at Athens." Diodorus, xvii. 113—7 (his annals of the archonship of Agesias), relates the death of Alexander, after having reigned twelve years and seven months, and states that in his archonship the 114th Olympiad was celebrated. The further tradition is that Alexander died 21st April, 323; and as 114 Ol. 1 must have begun in the summer of B.C. 324, and ended in the summer of B.C. 323, and the archonship of Agesias in it must have begun in May, 324, and ended in May, 323, as set forth in my *Tables II.*, *III.*, we see how all these traditions may be true, viz., that Alexander died 21st April, 323, as well as in 114 Ol. 1, and in the archonship of Agesias.

But if we turn to my *Table I.*, arranged according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, we see the archonship of Agesias in 114 Ol. 2; and as this began in the summer of B.C. 323, and ended in the summer of B.C. 322, the death of Alexander, if it happened on the 21st of April, 323, could not have been in the archonship of Agesias.

Further: we have had Ptolemy expressly placing the death of Alexander in 424 E.N., and this, as is shewn in our *Tables II.*, *III.*, must have been B.C. 324, saving that E.N. 424 must have begun on the 12th Nov., B.C. 325, and ended on 11th Nov., B.C. 324, on account of the recession of the Thoth. Hence the death of Alexander, on the 21st April, 323, could not have been in E.N. 424. Nor can we suppose that it was so stated in any contemporary record. Ptolemy may have heard the traditions that

Alexander died both in the archonship of Agesias and in 114 Ol. 1, and that the archonship of Agesias and 114 Ol. 1 were both in E.N. 424, as is shewn in our *Tables II., III.*; and Ptolemy may from thence have concluded,—but wrongly, as we have shewn,—that the death of Alexander was also in E.N. 424. Further: as we see in *Table I.*, by Ptolemy's placing the archonship of Apseudes in 432 B.C., the archonship of Agesias was neither in E.N. 424, nor in 114 Ol. 1, but in E.N. 425 and in 114 Ol. 2. Further: this evident mistake of Ptolemy, as to the death of Alexander having been in E.N. 424, leads strongly to the suspicion that the dates E.N., which are assigned to all Ptolemy's eclipses, are merely the results of calculations by Hipparchus, and not given in their original records; and this suspicion is strongly confirmed by the manner in which Ptolemy introduces the mention of E.N. in his *Almagest*. Thus, in his lib. iv. 11, Ptolemy says, "He (Hipparchus) says that these three eclipses were observed at and brought from Babylon, and that the first occurred when Phanostratus was archon at Athens, in the month of Posideon. This date was in the three hundred and sixty-sixth year from Nabonasar, according to the Egyptians, as he (Hipparchus) says, Thoth 26." At all events, these mistakes of Ptolemy as to the death of Alexander should leave no room to doubt Ptolemy's want of historical accuracy. I should also notice that Hipparchus and Ptolemy place all the archons of Diodorus in different years of an Olympiad from those in which they are placed by Diodorus. Thus Diodorus, like Dr. Hincks, gives Pythodorus as archon in the first year of an Olympiad: but, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, he must have been archon in 87 Ol. 2. All this must result from Hipparchus and Ptolemy placing the archonship of Apseudes one year lower than it is placed by Diodorus, unless we suppose that Diodorus has inserted an archon too many between Apseudes and Agesias; and, if he has, his chronology must be rejected.

*Utrum mavis accipe.*

If this be not enough, let us look to the effect which the beginning of the archonship of Apseudes being in B.C. 432, 87 Ol. 1, has upon the Peloponnesian war. By this arrangement, the fourth and twelfth years of the war must each have been in the fourth year of an Olympiad; but we have been reminded by Dr. Hincks, that, according to Thucydides, the twelfth year of the war was the first year of an Olympiad, and Thucydides, lib. iii. 8, makes the same remark as to the fourth year of the war. If this be not enough, let us look to the years B.C. in which the several years of the war must have been, by the beginning of the archonship of Apseudes being in B.C. 432. If his archonship

began in May, B.C. 432, it must have ended in May, 431. Consequently, the archonship of Pythodorus, his immediate successor, must have begun in May 431, and ended in May 430; and, as we have learnt from Thucydides that the war began a few days before the 19th March, two months before the end of the archonship of Pythodorus, it must have begun a few days before 19th March, in B.C. 430, and its first year must have ended a few days before 19th March, B.C. 429, as set forth in *Table I*. But we have learnt from Dr. Hincks that the eclipse of the sun, of which Thucydides speaks as having been in the first year of the war, was on the 3rd August, 431. As the *Table* also shews, the eighth year of the war must, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy, have begun a few days before 19th March, 423, and ended a few days before 19th March, 422; the eclipse of the sun for this year is 21st March, 424. As the *Table* also shews, the nineteenth year of the war must have begun a few days before 19th March, 412, and ended a few days before 19th March, 411, and the eclipse of the moon for this year is 27th August, 413.

Thus Hipparchus and Ptolemy, instead of confirming Diodorus (as alleged by Dr. Hincks), are completely opposed to him. The variation between them is but of a single year; but where an eclipse is concerned, the variation of a single year must be held to be fatal, and this surely must be enough to convince even Dr. Hincks that Hipparchus and Ptolemy must have erred in placing the beginning of the archonship of Apseudes, and with it the beginning of the Metonic cycle, in B.C. 432, that is, at the distance of one hundred and fifty-two years from the summer solstice in B.C. 280.

Consequently, the Metonic cycle must have begun in some other year; consequently, the end of the eighth Metonic cycle must have been in some other summer solstice than the summer solstice in B.C. 280; consequently, the observation of the summer solstice by Aristarchus in 50 Cal. Per. I., if made at the end of the eighth Metonic cycle, must have been made at some other summer solstice than that in B.C. 280.

I trust that sufficient has now been done to set aside the *Almagest* altogether as authority in the matter of chronology: for to vitiate these three eclipses, must surely be to vitiate the whole system: for it is bound together by its eclipses. Consequently, if my object were merely victory, to triumph over fallen foes, I might well be content to rest here, and put my sword into its sheath, and bind three such mighty men as Hipparchus, Ptolemy, and Dr. Hincks, to my chariot wheels, and cry, *Io, triumphe!* and, pointing to this state of confusion, say to my weeping foes, *Hinc illæ lacrymæ?* The exposure of error is

important: but the establishment of truth is more so; and to attain this object I shall consider more fully the Metonic cycle in connection with the Calippic period.

That it was held by Hipparchus and Ptolemy that the observation of the summer solstice, which was made by Aristarchus in 50 Cal. Per. I., was made at the summer solstice of B.C. 280, as being the summer solstice in the forty-fourth year after the death of Alexander, and also as being the summer solstice at the end of one hundred and fifty-two years from the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes, has been abundantly shewn. I shall now shew that it was also held by them that the observation by Aristarchus was also made at the summer solstice at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I.

In his *lib.* iv. 11 (according to the edition in Latin of 1528) Ptolemy says: "We will go also to the last three eclipses, which were produced to him (Hipparchus), and which he says were observed in Alexandria; and he (Hipparchus) says, that the first of them occurred in 54 Cal. Per. II., according to the Egyptians, the 16th of Messori (22 Sept.), and its date from the first of Nabonassar was 546y. 345d. 7h. My Greek edition of the *Almagest* of 1538 gives this eclipse as in 52 Cal. II.; but this must be an error. Hipparchus and Ptolemy's account in *Table I.* shews that 54 Cal. P. II., Sept. 22, was in 547 E.N., and the eclipse is found to have occurred on Sept. 22, B.C. 201.

If, as in Ptolemy's fifth eclipse, B.C. 523=225 E.N., then B.C. 201=547 E.N., (547 E.N. beginning 13th October, 202 B.C., and ending 12th October, 201 B.C.) Hence 22nd Sept., 201 B.C. would be in 547 E.N. Further: if 54 Cal. P. II., that is, if Cal. year 130=201 B.C., then Cal. year 1=330 B.C. Further: an eclipse on 22nd Sept. must have been in the beginning of a Calippic year, and if the beginning of the first Calippic year was at the summer solstice B.C. 330, the beginning of the fiftieth Calippic year must have been at the summer solstice in B.C. 281, and the summer solstice at the end of 50 Cal. P. I., must have been the summer solstice B.C. 280.

Further: Hipparchus says that the third of these three eclipses was in 55 Cal. P. II., 5 Messori, and Ptolemy says its date was 547y. 334d. 14h. 15m. E.N., and its date has been calculated as 12 Sept., 200 B.C. It will be seen at once that this must give precisely the same results. In *lib.* vi. 5 Ptolemy says that there was an eclipse, 37 Cal. P. III., E.N. 607, 2 Tybi; and its date has been calculated as 27 Jan. 141 B.C. It will be found that this too will give precisely the same results, bearing in mind that an eclipse on the 27 Jan. must have been in the latter half of a Calippic year. In his *lib.* vii. 3,

after saying that Timocharis had made observations in 36, 47, and 48 Cal. P. I., Ptolemy goes on and says that they were respectively in 454, 465 and 466 *E.N.*, and from this it also follows, as may be seen in *Table I.*, that 50 Cal. P. I. must have been in 468 *E.N.*, that is, *B.C.* 280. This would place the beginning of the Calippic period in the archonship of Aristophanes, 112 Ol. 3, and in *B.C.* 330, according to Hipparchus and Ptolemy. Strauchius, *Brev. Chron.*, b. iii., c. i., s. 3, says: "The period of Calippus began in the summer of that year that Alexander the Great conquered Darius in a difficult battle at Arbela, which was in the third year of the 112th Olympiad, or in the year of the Julian period 4384, which is manifest from Ptolemy, *Almag.*, vii. 3, who brings observations from Timocharis at certain years of the first Calippic period."

Thus it is quite undeniable that the summer solstice at the end of 50 Cal. P. I., as thus attested, was the summer solstice in 280 *B.C.*, the exact solstice demanded by the several data of Hipparchus and Ptolemy for the observation of Aristarchus; and yet this observation could not have been made in this year *B.C.*, except, as we have most clearly shewn, upon these most incredible suppositions, viz., that the archonship of Agesias, in which Alexander is universally believed to have died, as being in 114 Ol. 1, was in reality in 114 Ol. 2; that the archonship of Aristophanes was in 112 Ol. 3, *B.C.* 330, and not in 112 Ol. 2, *B.C.* 331, as attested by an eclipse of the moon, at the battle of Arbela; that Diodorus has inserted an archon too much between the archonship of Menander and the archonship of Agesias, and placed all his archons in the wrong years of their respective Olympiads; that Phanostratus and Menander were both archons in the December preceding their year of office; that Thucydides has erred in speaking of the fourth and twelfth years of the Peloponnesian war as being each the first year of an Olympiad; that the Peloponnesian war began in the spring of *B.C.* 430, and that Hipparchus and Ptolemy are right in placing the beginning of the archonship of Agesias in 425 *E.N.*, though they place the death of Alexander, which took place in the end of this archonship, in 424 *E.N.* All this clearly follows from the beginning of the archonship of Apseudes being placed in *B.C.* 432. I should also notice that Strauchius bears testimony that I have not misrepresented the manner in which Hipparchus and Ptolemy have dealt with the archonship of Aristophanes. Under all these circumstances, I cannot doubt that the verdict of your readers must be that the accuracy of Hipparchus and Ptolemy is not to be sustained, and that the observation of Aristarchus must be held to have been made at some other solstice than *B.C.* 280, and

cannot be connected with 50 Cal. P. I.; if the first year of the Calippic period was in B.C. 330, unless it be connected with its beginning at the summer solstice in B.C. 281. That the chronology of Diodorus, which places the archonship of Apseudes in B.C. 433, would place the end of the eighth Metonic cycle, that is to say, 152 years, reckoned from the summer solstice in B.C. 433, in the summer solstice of B.C. 281, is obvious; and were it not that Hipparchus is altogether involved, as I have shewn, in the errors of Ptolemy, Dr. Hincks might with good reason have amended his plea, and urged that Ptolemy must have mistaken the meaning of Hipparchus, as to the end of the 152 years, when the observation was made by Aristarchus, having been at the end of 50 Cal. P. I. If the meaning of Hipparchus had been that the 152 years were to be regarded as ending at the summer solstice in the beginning of the said 50 Cal. P. I., and that the end of the said 50 Cal. P. I. was in the forty-fourth year from the death of Alexander; then the observation by Aristarchus would be placed in the summer solstice of B.C. 281, and Dr. Hincks might have produced Diodorus as confirming Hipparchus, as to the interval between the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes and the summer solstice in B.C. 281. We have seen Ptolemy making exactly a similar mistake in regard to the death of Alexander.

If the words, in which the tradition was handed down to Hipparchus, were the very words which Ptolemy has used, they would clearly be open to this interpretation. In his *lib. iii. 2* Ptolemy says, "There are from the recorded summer solstice in the time of Apseudes *down to the observation by Aristarchus in 50 Cal. P. I.*, as Hipparchus also says, 152 years, and from the said 50th year, which was the 44th year from the death of Alexander, down to the 463rd year (*from Alexander*), which was the year of my observation, there are 419 years. Therefore, in the intervening 571 years of the whole interval, if the summer solstice, observed by Euctemon, was in the beginning of 21 Phane-roth, there have been added to all the Egyptian years nearly 140 days and a half instead of 142 days and three fourths, which should be added to the 571 years, at the rate of the addition of a fourth part, minus the twelfth part of a day, according to the rate of the addition of a fourth part. Wherefore also it is evident that in all the 600 years (*before mentioned*) the solstice preceded the addition of the fourth part by nearly the two full days. We also find from many other observations that this has taken place, and we often see Hipparchus agreeing with it; for, in his work *On the Magnitude of the Year*, having compared the summer solstice, which was observed by Aristarchus at the end of the 50th year of the first Calippic period, with the observation which



was afterwards made by himself at the end of the 43rd year of the third Calippic period, he says thus: 'It is therefore,' etc."

That the observation by Aristarchus in 50 Cal. Per. I., which Hipparchus compared with an observation which he himself had made at the end of 43 Cal. Per. III., was made by Aristarchus at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I., we need not doubt; but it is not at all unreasonable to suppose that Aristarchus also made an observation of the summer solstice at the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I.; and, as Hipparchus has at least made a mistake in reference to the year B.C. in which the observation must have been made by Aristarchus, at the end of the Metonic cycle, he may also have made a mistake as to its having been made at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I. The expression, "*down to the observation by Aristarchus in 50 Cal. Per. I.*," does not at all necessarily imply that the observation was made in the end of 50 Cal. Per. I., and, as the many incredibilities which would arise from the archonship of Apseudes being placed in B.C. 432, lead to the inevitable conclusion that the end of the 8th Metonic cycle could not have been at the summer solstice 280 B.C., that is, at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I., on the supposition that the beginning of the Calippic period was in B.C. 330, as attested by these three eclipses of Ptolemy, it follows necessarily that the end of the eighth Metonic cycle could not be connected at all with the said 50 Cal. Per. I., unless it was connected with it at its beginning at the summer solstice in B.C. 281, and this it would be if the archonship of Apseudes, and with it the beginning of the Metonic cycle, was in B.C. 433, as given by Diodorus. But this placing of Apseudes in B.C. 433 by Diodorus must be most carefully considered; for, instead of the list of Diodorus being confirmed, as Dr. Hincks asserts, by a record which may be considered contemporary, I have shewn most clearly that it is most clearly contradicted by this identical record; but I must admit that the author of the statement in this record (*The Almagest*) is not Aristarchus, a cotemporary, as asserted by Dr. Hincks, and who made his observation in 50 Cal. Per. I., but Hipparchus, who made his observations so late as 50 Cal. Per. III.

That the observation of Aristarchus was made in 50 Cal. Per. I., and made at the end of a Metonic cycle, I dare not doubt; nor dare I doubt that a veracious chronology must bear this as one of its tests; nor dare I deny that the placing of Apseudes in B.C. 433 would bear this test, if the Calippic period began in B.C. 330, as attested by these three eclipses of Ptolemy, and if the observation by Aristarchus was made in the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I. as thus deduced, that is, at the summer solstice B.C. 281.

But now comes the astounding fact that, according to the second of the three eclipses, which Hipparchus says were observed in Alexandria, the Calippic period must have begun, not in B.C. 330, but at the summer solstice in B.C. 331, the real year of the archonship of Aristophanes, as attested by the total eclipse of the moon at the battle of Arbela, 20th Sept., B.C. 331.

We have had the third of these three eclipses given by Hipparchus, as 55 Cal. Per. II., 5 Messori, and its calculated date, 12 Sept., 200 B.C., and this would place the beginning of the Calippic period, as we have seen, in B.C. 330; but the second of these three eclipses is also given by Hipparchus as 55 Cal. Per. II., 9 Mechir; and Ptolemy states that its date was 547y. 158d. 13h. 20m. E.N., and its calculated date is 19th March, 200 B.C. Now an eclipse in March must have been in the last half of a Calippic year, for each Metonic cycle and each Calippic period began and ended at a summer solstice, and therefore every year of each cycle and period must have begun and ended at a summer solstice. That the Calippic year began in the summer is evident from the statement of Ptolemy, that the observation of the summer solstice by Aristarchus at the end of 152 years from the summer solstice in the archonship of Apseudes was at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I., and that the observation of the summer solstice by Hipparchus was at the end of 43 Cal. Per. III.; and if the end of 55 Cal. Per. II., that is, if the end of the 131st Calippic year, was at the summer solstice in 200 B.C., its beginning must have been at the summer solstice in 201 B.C., and consequently the beginning of the first Calippic year must have been at the summer solstice 331 B.C.

Upon this I should notice that Ptolemy does not state by whom these three eclipses from Alexandria were observed, but merely states that they were observed at Alexandria, and that they were the last that were produced by Hipparchus; but it must be that these two, which occurred in March and Sept., 200 B.C., had been observed by two different astronomers, who held different views as to the commencement of the Calippic period, or they would not have been both placed in 55 Cal. Per. II. It seems strange also that neither Hipparchus nor Ptolemy should have noticed the inconsistency; but such is the overruling providence of God in at times blinding men's eyes, that they may not be prevented from handing down indubitable testimony of his own truthfulness. Further: if, at the time that these observations were made, that is, 131 years after the beginning of the Calippic period, there could be any doubt among astronomers as to the exact year of its beginning, we need not be surprised, either that there should be an uncertainty as to the

interval between the Peloponnesian war and the death of Alexander, or that Hipparchus, who lived so late as B.C. 128, should be in error as to the Metonic cycle, which terminated at the observation made by Aristarchus. The mistake which Hipparchus has evidently made as to the interval between the archonship of Apseudes and the 44th year after the supposed death of Alexander, leaves little room to doubt that his calling it 152 years (the 8th Metonic cycle) was merely the result of conjecture. He may have thought that the chronology of Diodorus was in error, but only to the extent of a year.

Further: the placing the beginning of the first Calippic year in B.C. 331 would place the end of 50 Cal. Per. I. in the summer solstice of B.C. 281, and this, if the observation by Aristarchus was really made at the end of the Calippic year, would quite agree with Apseudes being archon in 433 B.C., according to Diodorus: but the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I. would be at the summer solstice in B.C. 282. This, seeing the observation by Aristarchus could not have been at the end of 50 Cal. Per. I. in B.C. 280, should at once suggest that the beginning of the Metonic cycle may not have been in B.C. 433, but in some other year, yet in such a year that the end of some one of its cycles would be at the beginning of 50 Cal. Per. I. at the summer solstice in B.C. 282.

FRANKE PARKER.

[To be continued.]

---

*Presumption of men in refusing to believe what they cannot comprehend.*—The doctrine of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Emanuel, is beyond the grasp of human reason; but faith receives it, because it is clearly revealed; and for a man to reject a doctrine of revelation merely because it is beyond the grasp of his reason, is folly and presumption in the extreme, for it is saying in effect, that nothing can be true which he cannot comprehend. Pitiful creature! as though his grain of intellect were the standard of mental capacity to the universe, and nothing could be grasped by the Infinite Intelligence which is beyond the reach of his finite powers! Such an one reminds us of the man who had lived all his days in his native valley, and was at length induced to climb one of the neighbouring hills, when, looking abroad on the extended landscape, he exclaimed, "Well, I did not think the world had been so large before!" And when we ascend to the summits of the everlasting hills, and view the scenery around in the strong light of eternity, we shall perceive the truth is far more extensive, and the intellectual universe more vast than our utmost efforts of imagination had ever pictured them to be.—*Raffles*.

**THE DEPARTURE OF MY LADY MARY FROM THIS WORLD.**

THE following Syriac text, now edited for the first time, is, except from a linguistic point of view, perhaps rather curious than valuable. It is an early translation of one of the latest of the apocryphal books of the New Testament, the *Transitus beatæ Virginis*. This work, which was condemned, along with many others, by the Bishop Gelasius and the Council of Rome,\* A.D. 494, is already known to us in two shapes, *Latin* and *Arabic*, the Greek original (which is sometimes erroneously ascribed to Melito of Sardes) having been lost. The Latin version has been printed in the *Biblioth. Max. Patrum*, t. II., pars 2, pag. 212—216, and elsewhere. The Arabic has been recently edited, with a Latin translation and an interesting preface, by Enger (“*في نقله أم المسيح ، اخبار يوحنا السليح ، id est Joannis Apostoli de Transitu beatæ Mariæ Virginis Liber*”; Elberfeld, 1854).

The Latin text of the pseudo-Melito differs so completely from our Syriac, that we can scarcely be justified in looking upon it as a version of the same work. The Arabic translation, on the other hand, presents so few differences, and of such a character, that we can have no hesitation in pronouncing it to have been made from a later redaction of the Syriac than ours. The frequent amplifications, the occasional abridgements, and, above all, the gross exaggerations, clearly betray the hand of the modern embellisher.

In Syriac the work is extant in two manuscripts of the British Museum, Add. 14,484 and Add. 14,732.

Add. 14,484 is a large quarto, made up of parts of several vellum MSS., but we have here to deal only with the fragment comprising fol. 10—45. This contains: (1) part of the *Prot-evangelium Jacobi*, commencing in Cap. xvii. of the Greek text with the words *αὐτὴ ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου ποιήσει ὡς βούλεται*; (2) the *Evangelium Thomæ Israelitæ*, with the omission of the first chapter of the Greek text; and (3) the *Transitus beatæ Virginis*. It is written in a large, regular Estrangēlā, and seems, as nearly as I can judge, to belong to the latter half of the sixth century (say A.D. 550—600). Many of the diacritical points, however, have been added by a comparatively modern reader, who has also ventured here and there to make alterations in the text.

---

\* “*Liber, qui appellatur Transitus, id est, Assumptio sanctæ Mariæ, apocryphus*,” Labbe, *Sacrosancta Concilia*, t. v. col. 389.

Add. 14,732 is a paper MS. in large folio, probably of the thirteenth century. The *Transitus beatæ Virginis* occupies fol. 2*b*—fol. 16*a*. It is written in the ordinary Maronite character, with numerous diacritical points and occasional vowels.

The same book, or something similar, seems also to be extant in manuscript in the Æthiopic language. For instance, Cod. Brit. Mus. Add. 16,222 contains, among other things, a tract entitled *Visio Mariæ Virginis*, ascribed to St. John the Evangelist, of which Dillmann (Catal. p. 22) says: “Est visio, quam Maria de hominum post mortem statu vidit. Maria nube sursum elevata, comitante et interpretante Filio ipsius, loca et beatorum et damnatorum varia perlustrat, et qualia illic sunt supplicia qualesque beatitudines, cognoscit. Sed quia contra decorum esset, si Maria ipsa visionem scriberet, auctor ita rem instituit, ut Maria revelationem Joanni narraret, eique libri scriptionem commendaret.” With this compare in particular our sixth book.

The text, as it is here printed, is, I hope, an accurate reproduction of that of Add. 14,484. The notes give all the important variants of Add. 14,732, many of which, indeed, relate merely to matters of orthography. In several such cases I have thought it sufficient to note the difference only once. The remainder of the Syriac text, together with my translation of the whole, will appear in the next number of this Journal.

W. WRIGHT.

LONDON,

November, 1864.

*N.B.*—The reader will be pleased to observe that the following Syriac pages carry their own folios.









[illegible]

<sup>k</sup> B. adds 502.

<sup>1</sup> B. எழுதின.

<sup>m</sup> B. 1113.

<sup>n</sup> B. adds  $\sigma\sigma$ .

° B. ۱۰۰.

<sup>p</sup> B. **وَضَامِي**

<sup>a</sup> B. ۰۵۲۱۰.











<sup>i</sup> B. **مغذون** **ان**.





שבעה קלסות פתוחות דבוקות ב' חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 יבנה קרן קרן מלך ויבנה דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 סמל קרן קרן דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו  
 דבוקת חזיתותיהם. וזו

❖ କଥାଟା କିଛି

[illegible]

<sup>p</sup> B. وَجِبَانَتِي (*sic*).

<sup>8</sup> B. 𐎲𐎠𐎺.

<sup>v</sup> B. **عَلَيْهِ**.

<sup>w</sup> B. 21.



[illegible]

y B. ح.

<sup>z</sup> B. ۱۶۹۷۰.

<sup>a</sup> B.

<sup>b</sup> B. adds }σ.

<sup>c</sup> B. فأجاب.

<sup>d</sup> B. ۱۴۲۹.

<sup>c</sup> B. adds புத.

<sup>f</sup> B. **حاجتكم.**

g B. مغسل.

<sup>h</sup> B. adds  $\int$ .

i B. **منه**.







° B. دہ: عک.

<sup>p</sup> B.  S.

<sup>9</sup> B. **وَجَلَدٌ**.

г В. منه.

<sup>s</sup> B. omits **௩**.

<sup>t</sup> B. *مكتوب* *من* *الشيخ*.

11 B. **بجانب**.

<sup>v</sup> B. *၂၀၁၂*.

<sup>w</sup> B. **بجانب**.

x B. **١١٢٠**.

<sup>y</sup> B. 1492.













[illegible]

<sup>q</sup> B. مقبلا.

<sup>r</sup> B. adds, on the margin, *על מדין*.

<sup>5</sup> B. امتیاز.

<sup>t</sup> B. 1112.

<sup>u</sup> This passage has been printed and translated by the late Rev. Dr. Cureton in his work relating to the establishment and early history of Christianity at Edessa.

٧ B. كهنه.

<sup>w</sup> B. [30; 43].

\* B. ۱۸۵۳.



[illegible]

<sup>d</sup> B. සු.

<sup>e</sup> B. 2; 120.

<sup>r</sup> B. فف. بقا.

<sup>g</sup> B. adds *ṛṣṇa*.

<sup>h</sup> B. **خبب**. See the note on the translation of this passage, in which it is shewn that something has been accidentally omitted here.

<sup>1</sup> B. 180.











## CORRESPONDENCE.

---

[We wish our readers to understand that we cannot be held responsible for the opinions of our contributors and correspondents. The utmost we can do is to keep a careful eye upon the literary character of their communications, and to see that they do not transcend the limits of fair criticism and lawful inquiry.]

---

## THE SPIRITS IN PRISON.—1 PET. iii. 19.

WITH respect to the import of the nineteenth and the first part of the twentieth verse of 1 Pet. iii., interpreters have expressed two principal opinions, with various additions. The meaning of the apostle has been taken to be,

(1.) That Christ, after his death, preached, in the unseen world, to the spirits of disobedient antediluvians in confinement; or,

(2.) That Christ, by an inspired prophet, preached, before the flood, to men whose spirits were in confinement, when the epistle was written.

If we consider only the passage with its immediate context, we shall perhaps regard the first opinion as the more probable one. Christ, it is said, *went* (*πορευθεῖς*) to the spirits in prison. It would seem not unreasonable that this *πορευθεῖς* should be taken in a sense corresponding to that of the same word in verse 22, which speaks of Christ as “gone into heaven” (*πορευθεῖς εἰς οὐρανόν*). And thus it may appear that a preaching through Noah or any other person cannot be intended, but that the apostle designs to tell of an actual manifestation of Christ to the spirits in prison, and of such a transference of his presence as occurred when he left earth for heaven. Besides, the statement that Christ “preached unto *the spirits in prison*” may, not without appearance of reason, be regarded as signifying that they who are so spoken of were “spirits in prison” at the time of the preaching. The apostle, it may be said, would surely have expressed his meaning more clearly if he had meant that the preaching was addressed, ages before, to men whose spirits were in prison, when the epistle was written.

Notwithstanding these somewhat weighty arguments in support of the first interpretation, it cannot be denied that it is open to very serious objection. If this epistle tells of the preaching of Christ to the spirits of disobedient antediluvians in Hades, it stands alone. The fact of this preaching, if it be a fact, is not recorded in any other part of Scripture. This objection may not be insurmountable; still it may not unreasonably increase our caution in assenting to the interpretation in question. Suspicion is naturally awakened if a passage is so interpreted as not to appear in harmony with the analogy of Scripture.

Besides: why should the spirits of those who were disobedient in the days of Noah be selected? If Christ had preached in Hades

at all, would he not have preached to *all* the spirits of the disobedient?

Again: it appears not easy to see what connection the statement that Christ preached in Hades can have with the general design and intent of the epistle; what consolation it could afford to persons in heaviness through manifold temptations, or how it could encourage them to gird up the loins of the mind, and to await, steadfast in the faith, the appearing of Jesus Christ.

Of the second interpretation, it can scarcely be said that it is not in conformity with the analogy of Scripture, since we find evidence elsewhere that Christ was regarded as present in Old Testament times and events. Still difficulty results from the use of the word *προρευθεῖς*; from those preached to being designated merely "spirits in prison;" and also from there being no mention of Christ's preaching through an inspired prophet; but instead of this, the words *προρευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν*. Besides, it may still seem that if such preaching occurred, the mention of it would have little congruity with the general design of the epistle.

These difficulties will, however, as it appears to me, in great measure be got rid of, if we apply, as a key to the apostle's meaning, an indication furnished by verses 20, 21. Baptism is there spoken of as *antitypical* (*ἀντίτυπον*) to the water of the flood which preserved the ark and the eight persons within it. What, in this particular, is stated, is probably, with respect to other particulars, implied—that *the time of the flood corresponded to that in which the apostle and his readers lived; or that the one was related to the other as type to antitype.*

But a comparatively short time before the epistle was written, Christ had come from heaven; had preached to the Jews; and had given warning of coming judgments. If it be supposed that the apostle intended to indicate that there was, in the days preceding the flood, what corresponded to or was typical of Christ's earthly ministry, we may be able to understand better the *προρευθεῖς ἐκήρυξεν*, "he went and preached," of verse 19. If the apostle had merely said that Noah, inspired by the Spirit of Christ, preached before the flood, the analogy would not have been so apparent as it is when the human agent passes into the background and disappears. *Christ* preached to the disobedient Jews, and *Christ* preached to the disobedient antediluvians. Thus, even if the preaching was by Noah,<sup>a</sup> we may be able to account for there being no mention of a human agent, but simply the statement "in which he went and preached." It should be observed that the idea of the *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ* being present in Noah quite agrees with what we read in chap. i. 11 of the Spirit of Christ being in the prophets, and foretelling Christ's sufferings and Christ's glory. And it is not unimportant to remark that the expression *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, "the Spirit of Christ," as used of prophetic

<sup>a</sup> The reader should compare the statement respecting Noah in 2 Pet. ii. 5; the *κήρυκα* with the *ἐκήρυξεν* of our passage, the *ὄγδοον* with the *ὄκτω* of ver. 20.

inspiration, is, in the New Testament books, peculiar to this epistle. Nor ought we perhaps to keep out of view the use elsewhere of *πνεῦμα*, or at least of its adjective *πνευματικός*, in relation to what was typical. Thus 1 Cor. x. 3, 4, "And all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink, for they were drinking from a spiritual rock which followed, and that rock was Christ."

The *καὶ* of verse 19 appears to be in accordance with the opinion that the apostle had before his mind such a correspondence or analogy as that above mentioned. Christ had come from heaven, and had preached to the Jews of his kingdom, and of coming judgment; and "He went and preached *also* to the spirits in prison."

Again: the majority of men did not regard the preaching of Christ and the apostles; they obeyed not the gospel of God. In this respect, also, there was correspondence with the days of the flood. Then, too, men in general were disobedient; and only eight souls were saved in the ark. It appears probable that reference was made (verse 20) to the smallness of the number of persons saved in the ark, in order to suggest to those to whom the epistle was addressed that they were not to conclude that God did not regard them, even if they were but few as compared even with the unbelieving Jews. They should remember the days of the flood. Those whom God then preserved were only eight persons. The apostle, it should be observed, gives prominence to the smallness of the number saved in the days of the flood, placing the "few souls" *λίγαι* before the "eight" *ὀκτώ*. The fact of this prominence appears to agree entirely with the supposition that the apostle designed to suggest that the comparative fewness of those whom he addressed would not prevent their being saved. Noah and his family, though few indeed, only eight souls, were yet saved in the ark: so would they be saved if they remained steadfast unto the end.

The *ποτε* of ver. 20, like the *καὶ* of the verse preceding, appears to have resulted from the apostle's having before his mind the fact that his own days corresponded to those of the flood. The mention of those "who disobeyed *formerly*," may well have originated from the apostle's thinking of those who were disobeying *then*, and who are repeatedly spoken of in the Epistle as *ἀπειθοῦντες* (comp. ii. 7, 8; iv. 17), the present participle of the very same verb being employed which is used in ver. 20 in the aorist. The *ἀπειθοῦντες* in the passages just referred to were probably unbelieving Jews. This might lead us to think it likely that when the apostle speaks of those "who disobeyed *formerly*," it is with "reference to the *Jews*, who then were disobedient unto the gospel of God." And an additional reason of some weight in support of this position results from the fact, that it was the unbelieving Jews who "killed the Lord Jesus," and just before (ver. 18) the apostle had been speaking of the death of Christ.

Reference has been already made to the mention of baptism as antitypical, in ver. 21. The probably true reading of the first words of this verse is *ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον*. The sense may accordingly be given thus: "Which (*i.e.*, water), antitypical to that of the flood,

now saves you also; I mean baptism, but not the mere putting away of the filth of the flesh," etc.

It does not seem impossible to suggest a reason for the apostle's expressly stating that the water of the flood was typical of baptism, while he does not explicitly state what it was in his own times that corresponded to the preaching in the days of the flood, to the disobedience of the antediluvians, and to the small number of persons who were saved in the ark. The antitype with respect to each of these last-mentioned particulars might with less difficulty suggest itself to the reader's mind. Still it may seem that even with regard to these particulars the analogy was not so obvious that a reader, without previous acquaintance with the subject, would be able readily to understand the apostle's meaning. If, however, we have reason to think that the apostle himself had often reflected on the correspondence between his own days and those of the flood, and that he had grounds for supposing that his readers also would be familiar with the subject, then we may account for the manner in which it is introduced. Now, that the correspondence in question had been often before the apostle's mind, may appear probable if we take into account the parallel which our Lord himself had drawn in the prophecy recorded in Matt. xxiv.: "For as the days of Noe, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days of the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day when Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." It can scarcely appear other than reasonable to suppose that this parallel often engaged the apostle's thoughts, especially as the time drew nigh for the first fulfilment of the prophecy concerning Christ's coming; for the final overthrow of the Jewish theocratic kingdom, and for the destruction of Jerusalem, its ancient seat and centre. It must appear also a reasonable supposition that a knowledge of our Lord's prophecy was widely diffused among the Christians to whom the epistle was addressed.<sup>b</sup> We may thus account for the apostle's referring to the correspondence between his own times and those of the flood, as though the subject were one with which his readers were familiar.

Still it may be thought that no sufficient reason has been adduced for the apostle's speaking of those who were disobedient before the flood, with reference to their condition, not at the time of the preaching, but at the time when the Epistle was written. It should be observed, however, that the parallel drawn by our Lord would naturally tend to direct attention to the *punishment* of the disobedient antediluvians. It may thus have led to their doom being frequently spoken of; and it may well be supposed that if Christians

<sup>b</sup> The opinion is probably true that there are allusions to our Lord's prophecy in 1 Peter iv. 17, 18; the time for "the judgment to begin from the house of God," referring to the persecution predicted Matt. xxiv. 9, and the words, "If the righteous scarcely be saved," to the not going down from the housetop, or returning from the field.

believed at the time that a similar doom awaited those who reviled and persecuted them, the subject would have for them a deep, if painful, interest. Now if it be remembered that the leading subject of the verses immediately preceding our passage (13—18) was the hostility to which those whom the apostle addressed were exposed, we may assign a probable reason for his calling the disobedient antediluvian "spirits in prison," that he might hint at the doom which awaited those persecutors and revilers of whom he had been just before speaking.

In conclusion, I may say a word on 1 Peter iv. 6, *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσιν δὲ κατὰ Θεὸν πνεύματι*. The difficulty which has been felt with regard to this passage appears to me to have proceeded to a considerable extent from the *γὰρ* being taken as referring to something said in ver. 5, and not to the "suffering in the flesh" and "ceasing from sin" which forms the leading subject of chap. iv. 1—6. It would seem as if the mention of the "dead" in ver. 5 had suggested to the apostle that some of those to whom the gospel had been preached, and who had embraced it, were included among the dead, and that he then adduces them as furnishing another example of "suffering in the flesh" and "ceasing from sin." The gospel was preached to them "that they might be judged (*κριθῶσιν*), with respect to men, in the flesh, but may live, (*ζῶσιν*) with respect to God, in the spirit." The being "judged, with respect to men, in the flesh," would correspond to the "suffering in the flesh" of ver. 1, and the "living, with respect to God, in the spirit," to the "ceasing from sin." The *aorist* *κριθῶσιν* would accord with the fact that their "suffering in the flesh," the condemnation which had been endured from men, was already past, while the *present* *ζῶσιν* would appropriately represent the continuance of their freedom from sin, in the holy and blessed life which they ever live unto God.

London, November 7, 1864.

THOMAS TYLER.

#### NOTE ON ROMANS VIII. 17, 18.

THE remarks of J. W. F. on this passage in the last number seem to me to call for some reply. May I be allowed to state as briefly as possible why I cannot accept his views? He begins by asserting that the words which in these verses are rendered in our English Version "suffering with" and "sufferings," have not in the original that restricted meaning, and goes on to give his reasons why such a meaning in his opinion is unsuitable. He would take *συμπάσχομεν*, in verse 17, to mean "a state of communion with," and *παθήματα*, in verse 18, he takes to mean the actual condition of the person spoken of, but not necessarily a state of pain or affliction. But J. W. F. brings no passage from Scripture forward in support of this interpretation, except Gal. v. 24, "Have crucified the flesh with the *affec-*



tions." What does *παθήματα*, here translated "affections," really mean? It is used again in Rom. vii. 5, apparently in the same sense, "the *motions* of sin which were by the law." I see no reason why the word should not be taken to mean "sufferings" in both these passages, just as elsewhere. The sufferings of the flesh are as sinful as its pleasures, and are to be crucified. The verb *πάσχω* is always used in the New Testament in the strict sense "to suffer." I think that *πάθημα* must have the same meaning.

But J. W. F. next appeals to the context. "In the preceding passage not one word," he tells us, "occurs in which any condition of pain or sorrow is expressed or implied." I take a different view of the context. The whole passage, it seems to me, turns on ver. 13, the latter part of which certainly implies suffering, and makes it the condition of "life." "If ye through the Spirit do *mortify* the deeds of the body, ye shall live." The latter clause of the 17th verse, I take to be a repetition of the same sentiment in other words; "If so be that we *suffer* with him, that we may be also glorified together."

But J. W. F. asserts further that it is unscriptural to speak of believers as suffering *with* Christ. Perhaps the best way to answer this assertion is to refer to Scripture itself. How far Christians partake of Christ's sufferings I will not now enquire, although I see no reason why they should not share in all that pertained to his human nature. But what is to be said to the following passages? In 2 Cor. i. 5 we read: "For as the sufferings (*παθήματα* clearly=*θλίψεις* in preceding verse) of Christ abound in us, (better 'overflow to us,') so our consolation also abounded by Christ." Again, in Phil. iii. 10, 11, "That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death: if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Again, in Col. i. 24, "Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up that which is behind of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh." And once more, in 1 Peter iv. 13, "But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." Surely these passages not only prove that believers can *suffer with* Christ, but that they must, as the one condition of sharing his glory. Independently, however, of these passages, it may be asked, If men are to share Christ's glory, why should it be thought strange that they are to share his sufferings? J. W. F., indeed, tells us next that a condition of affliction is not to be regarded as peculiar to the Christian profession. But how does this harmonize with what St. Paul says to Timothy: "All that will live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution?" What J. W. F. says of our Lord's own teaching seems to me to be sufficiently answered by those passages, wherein He distinctly connects his suffering and glorification with that of his disciples. Take, for instance, John xii. 23-26, "The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground

and die, it abideth alone: but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit. He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any man serve me, *let him follow me*; and where I am, there also shall my servant be; if any man serve me, him will my Father honour." Here, when He speaks of his own suffering, he forthwith calls upon his disciples to suffer with him. See, further, Luke ix. 22, 23.

The other and "conclusive" reason given by J. W. F. why the apostle cannot mean to describe a state of affliction in Rom. viii. 17, 18, I must confess I do not quite understand, nor accordingly do I see how light is thereby thrown upon ver. 20. I would remark, however, that J. W. F. seems to make no distinction between the "creature" and the "sons of God." Those who have the first-fruits of the Spirit (ver. 23), who are themselves a kind of first-fruits (James i. 18), are clearly distinct from the "creature" (Col. i. 23). They are the "elect," I take it, whose manifestation is to be the precursor of the subjection of the "creature" to Christ, as it has hitherto been subject to vanity. At present, God's sovereignty is shewn in saving some and passing by others. Free-will is excluded (ver. 20); God it is that hath subjected the majority to vanity, but only for a time, "in hope." The "creature," also generally, is to share the glorious liberty of the sons of God at the appointed time (ver. 21; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 23—28). A. W.

---

### THE MEMORIAL NAME.

IN the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for October, 1864, among the editorial notices, appears the following,—

"*Jehovah the Redeemer God, the Scriptural Interpretation of the Divine Name Jehovah.* By Thomas Tyler, B.A. London.—This work is an enlargement of a former article by the author, which appeared in *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, January, 1854, under the title of 'The Antediluvian Theocracy.' Its distinguishing position in regard to the origin and import of the name Jehovah, is the same that was subsequently maintained by Mr. Alexander Mac Whorter, in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, in an article which appeared in January, 1857, entitled, 'Jehovah considered as a Memorial Name,' and in a volume entitled, *Yahveh Christ; or, The Memorial Name*, in respect to both of which productions the author of the volume now under consideration complains that Mr. Mac Whorter has reproduced his view in a modified form, but with the omission of an acknowledgment of the source whence the ideas on which they were based were derived."

The editors of the *Bibliotheca Sacra* do Mr. Tyler injustice. Mr. Tyler complains in his preface, that we, in company with another of the predatory horde of "Macs" (a certain Dr. Mac Donald), have failed to make "suitable" acknowledgment to him for his ideas. This savours somewhat of the old English prejudice

against the Picts and Scots, and might perhaps have been expected, —but it is certainly remarkable that the editors of the *Bib. Sac.* should have made such an unqualified statement of omission in connection with an article published in 1857 in their own magazine.

We quote from that article,—“Those curious to ascertain the opinion of English critics on this point (the origin of the name Jehovah) will find the view here taken maintained at length in *Scripture Testimonies to Messiah*, fourth edition, by Dr. J. Pye Smith, and tacitly assumed by the distinguished scholar who writes in Kitto's *Jour. Sac. Lit.* over the signature T. T. ‘Antedil. Theoc.’ Jan. 1854.”

It appears that Mr. Tyler is not satisfied with being called “a distinguished scholar,” and to do ourself justice, we are forced to state that at that time we supposed T. T. to represent a far more eminent name. We incorporated this notice in the body of the article for the purpose of directing attention to his interesting discussion of various points of interpretation on Genesis. We did not, however, distinguish him, or intend to distinguish him, above Dr. J. Pye Smith, Luther, and many others who have discussed the same points and taken the same views. He surely will not claim Luther's translation of Eve's remark, “I have gotten a man, Jehovah;” he cannot patent the idea that this name had an historical, later growth as the Divine Name, becoming transferred to Elohim, the indication of the time when it began to be thus used appearing in the record, Gen. iv. 26, for on this point, leaving out other authorities we will cite Dr. Palfrey, *Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities*, Boston, 1840, vol. ii., page 47.

“Gen. iv. 26.—The clause would be literally rendered as follows, ‘Then was it begun,’ (the form of the verb is a common one of the Hebrew impersonal); that is, ‘*Then did men begin*’ to call God by the name ‘Jehovah,’ or to call Jehovah by his name. Perhaps it may be even better regarded as a concluding remark by Moses upon the whole passage, even so early as this had men begun to apply the sacred name by which the Deity is now known to us Jews.”

The other main point (there are but three) is the often discussed threefold affirmation to Moses of the memorial name. On this, see any Hebrew Thesaurus.

Mr. Tyler bases no Christological argument upon these positions. In fact, without a more careful study, and a more thorough assumption of the documentary construction of the Book of Genesis than he exhibited in 1854, he had no proper framework. It is upon this analysis of the Book of Genesis that the whole argument rests. Without it, any expressed preference of modes of interpretation, or of Messianic views, is purely in the air.

To develop a Christology based upon the documentary construction, was the purpose both of the article in the *Bib. Sac.* and of the volume entitled *The Memorial Name*. This development, so far as we know, is new.

Mr. Tyler now comes out with a Christological argument, which

we should infer, not having seen it, is a decided advance upon his former article.

In the preface to *The Memorial Name*, we expressly disclaimed originality in respect of any fact or interpretation brought forward. In an historical discussion, a writer does not usually invent his premises; at least, it is not commonly considered meritorious to do so. Having taken this stand at the outset, and divided our acknowledgments among the whole race of scholars who had gone before, we cannot complain of Mr. Tyler for denying this kind of originality to us, but only for claiming so marvellous a share for himself,

Newhaven, October, 1864.

ALEXANDER MAC WHORTER.<sup>c</sup>

### THE LORD'S PRAYER.

*Anglo-Saxon, Danish-Saxon, English, and Scotch.*

#### I.

From Camden's *Remains*, A.D.  
700:—

Uren Fader thic arth in heofnas,  
Sic gehalgud thin noma,  
To cymeth thin ric,  
Sic thin willa sue is in heofnas  
and in eortho.

Uren hlaf ofer-wirtlic sel us to  
daeg,  
And forgef us scylda urna, sue  
we forgefán scyldgum urum.  
And no inlead usith in costnung,  
Ah gefrig urich from ifle.

#### II.

Danish-Saxon about 875, translated by King Alfred, from John Wilkins' *Essay towards a Real Character*, p. 7.

Fäder ure, thu the earth on heofenum,  
Si thin nama gehalgod,  
To be cume thin rice,  
Gewurthe thin wille on eorthan swa swa on heofnum.  
Urne ge dāghwanlican hlaf syle us to dāg,

And forgyf us ure gyltas, swa swa we forgyfath urum gyltendum.

And ne gelādde thu us on costnung,  
Ac alyse us of yfle.

#### III.

Danish-Saxon about 880, translated by Father Aldred, from Astley *On Writing*, p. 100.

Fader uren, thu arth in heofnum,  
Si gehalgud noma thin,  
To cymeth ric thin,  
Sic willo thin suae is in heofne and in eortha.

Hlaf usenne of wistlic sel us to dāg,  
And fergef us scylda usna suā ue fergefon scyldgum usum.  
And ne inlād usih in costunge,  
Uh gefrig usich from yfle.

#### IV.

Danish-Saxon, about 900; from Wm. l'Isle's *Saxon Monuments* and Camden's *Remains*, p. 23.

Thu ure Fader the eart on heofenum,

<sup>c</sup> The preceding has been forwarded to us by Mr. Mac Whorter, with a request for its insertion, and we have pleasure in admitting it.—Ed. J. S. L.

Si thin nama gehalgod,  
 Cume thin rice,  
 Si thin willa on eorþa swa swa  
 on heofenum.  
 Syle us to dæg urne dagwanlican  
 hlaf.  
 And forgyf us ure gyltas swa swa  
 we forgyfath tham the with us  
 agyltath.  
 And ne lād thu us on costnung,  
 Ac alys us fram yfele.

## v.

From Cotton MSS., Cleopatra,  
 B, xiii., *Reliquiae Antiquae*, i.,  
 35.

Thu ure Faeder the eart on heof-  
 enum,  
 Sy thin nama gehalgod,  
 Gecume thin rice,  
 Sy thin willa swa swa on heofe-  
 num swa eac on eorþan.  
 Syle us to dæg urne daeghwam-  
 lican hlaf,  
 And forgyf us ure gyltas, swa swa  
 we forgyfath tham the with us  
 agyltath.  
 And ne laed thu na us on cost-  
 nunge,  
 Ac alys us fram yfele.

## vi.

By Father Farman, e cod. Rush-  
 worth; Matt. vi. in Chamber-  
 layne, 57; Mithridates, ii., 333.  
 Fäder ure thu the in heofunum,  
 Beo gehalgud thin noma,  
 Cume to thine rice,  
 Weorthe thin willa swa swa on  
 heofune swilc on eorthe.  
 Hlaf userne dāghwamlicu sel us  
 so dæg,  
 And forlete us ure scylde, swa  
 swa we ec forleten thām the  
 scyldigat with us.  
 And ne gelāt us geleade in cost-  
 nungā,  
 Ah gelese us of yfele.

## vii.

From the same MS. as preceding,  
 Luke xi., Chamberlayne, 57;  
 Mithridates, ii., 333.

Fäder user se the is on heofnum,  
 Gihalgod bith noma thin,  
 To cymeth rice thin,  
 Sie willa thin sie swa on heofne  
 and on heortho.  
 Hlaf userne dāghwāmlice sel us  
 to däge,  
 And forsgef us synne use swa  
 fästlice and ec we forgeofas  
 eghwelce scylde user.  
 And ne usih on lād thu in cost-  
 unge,  
 Ah afria usih from yfele.

## viii.

Danish-Saxon from Fras. Junius  
 and Thos. Marshall, Utrecht,  
 1684, Matt. vi.; Mithridates,  
 ii., 334.

Fäder ure thu the eart on heofe-  
 num,  
 Si thin nama gehalgod,  
 To-becume thin rice,  
 Gewurthe thin willa on eorþan  
 swa swa on heofenum.  
 Urne dāghwamlican hlaf syle us  
 to dæg,  
 And forgyf us ure gyltas, swa swa  
 we forgyfath urum gyltendum.  
 And ne gelādde thu us on cost-  
 nunge,  
 Ac alys us of yfele.

## ix.

By Pope Arian, about 1156, Cam-  
 den's *Remains*, p. 24.

Ure Fadyr in heaven rich,  
 Thy name he halyed ever lich,  
 Thou bring us thy michel bliss,  
 Als hit in heaven y-do.  
 Evar in yearth beene it also  
 That holy bread that lasteth ay  
 Thou sent it us this ilke day.

Forgive ous all that we have don,  
As we forgiveth uch other mon.  
Ne let ous fall into no founding,  
Ac shield ous fro the fowle thing.

## x.

From MS. Cotton, Vitellius, A,  
xii., fol. 181, early in the 12th  
century, *Rel. Antiq.*, i., 204.

Fader ure the giert on heofena,  
Sy thin nama gehalgod,  
Cume thin riche,  
Sy thin willa on geortha swo swo  
on heofona.

Ure deghwamlica hlaf gyf us to  
deg,  
And forgyf us ure gyltas swo swo  
we forgyfath tham the with us  
agyltath.  
And ne lede us on costnunga,  
Ac alys us of yfele.

## xi.

English, about 1160, from a MS.  
of the four gospels in Wanley,  
76, Chamberlayne, 59, Mithri-  
dates, ii., 335.

Ure Fäder thu the on heofene  
eart,  
Syo thin name gehaleged,  
To cume thin rice,  
Geworde thin wille on heofene  
and on eorthe.  
Syle us to daig urne daighwam-  
liche hlaf,  
And forgyf us ure geltes swa we  
forgyfath aelcen thare the with  
us agylteth.  
And ne lād thu us on costnunge,  
Ac alys us fram yfele.

## xii.

From MS. Cotton, Cleopatra, B,  
vi., folio 201, *Rel. Antiq.*, i.,  
22.

Ure Fadir that hart in hevene,  
Halged be thi name with giftes  
sevene,  
Samin cume thi kingdom,

Thi wille in herthe als in hevene  
be don.

Ure bred that lastes ai  
Gyve it hus this hilke dai,  
And ure misdedis thu forgyve hus  
Als we forgyve tham that misdōn  
hus.

And leod us in tol na fandinge,  
Bot frels us fra alle ivele thinge.

## xiii.

From MSS. in the Cam. Pub.  
Lib. Hh., vi., 11, of the 13th  
century, on vellum, *Rel. Ant.*,  
i., 169.

Hure Fader that art in hevene,  
blessed be thi name,  
Thin holi heverichemote us cumen  
to frame,  
Thi wil be don in hevene and in  
erthe ii same.

To day us yif ure lifi bred that  
ilke dai we craven,  
And foryif us oure dettes so  
stronge so we hes haven,  
Also we don alle men that in our  
dettes aren.

And lede us noht in fonding, but  
silde us from harm and fro  
schame,  
And fro alle kennes iveles, thur-  
uh thin holi name.

## xiv.

From MS. in Caius Col., Cam-  
bridge, of the 13th century,  
*Rel. Antiq.*, i., 282.

Fader oure that art in heve [sic]  
Ihalgeed bee thi nome,  
Icume thi kinereiche,  
Yworthe thi wille also is in he-  
vene so be on erthe.

Oure iche-dayes bred gif us to  
day,  
And forgif us oure gultes also we  
forgifet oure gultare.  
And ne led ous nowth into fon-  
dingge,  
Auth ales ous of harme.

## XV.

From MS. Arundel. 292, fol. 3,  
of the earlier part of the 13th  
century, *Rel. Antiq.*, i., 235.

Fader ure thatt art in hevene  
blisse,  
Thin hege nume itt wurthe blis-  
cedd,  
Cumen itt mote thi kingdom,  
Thin hali wil it be al don  
In hevene and in erthe all so,  
So itt sall ben ful wel ic tro.  
Gif us alle one this dai  
Ure bred of iche dai,  
And forgyve us ure sinne  
Als we don ure witherwinnes.  
Leet us noct in fondinge falle,  
Ooc fro ivel thu sild us alle.

## XVI.

English of the 13th century.  
Chamberlayne, 72, Mithridates,  
ii., 335.

Oure Fader that art in hevenes,  
Halewid be thi name,  
Thy kingdom come,  
To be thi wille do as in hevene  
and in erthe.  
Gyff to us this day oure brede  
over other substance,  
And forgyve to us our dettis as  
forgyven to oure dettours.  
And lede us not into temptatioun,  
But delyve us fro yvel.

## XVII.

From MS. Harl., No. 3724, fol.  
44, of the 13th century, *Rel.*  
*Antiq.*, i., 57.

Ure Fader in hevene riche,  
Thi name be haliid ever iliche,  
Thu bringe us to thi michil blisce,  
Thi wille to wirche thu us wisse,  
Als hit is in hevene ido  
Ever in eorthe ben it al so.  
That holi bred that lesteth ay  
Thu send hit ous this ilke day.  
Forgive ous alle that we havith  
don

Als we forgyvet uch other man.  
Ne lete us falle in no fondinge,  
Ak scilde us fro the foule thinge.

## XVIII.

From the MS. Arundel, 57, fol.  
94, in the Kentish dialect,  
1840, *Rel. Antiq.*, i., 42.

Vader oure thet art ine hevenes,  
Yhalyed by thi name,  
Cominde thi riche,  
Yworthe thi wil ase ine hevene  
and ine erthe.  
Bread oure eche dayes yef ous to  
day,  
And vorlet ous ours yeldinges,  
ase and we vorleteth oure yel-  
deres.  
And ne ous lad nayt in to von-  
dinge,  
Ac vri ous uram queade.

## XIX.

English, about 1370, from Wi-  
cliffe, *New Test.*, Camden's *Re-*  
*mains*, 25.

Our Fadyr that art in hevenes,  
Halloed be thy name.  
Thy kingdom come to,  
Be thy will done in ertne as in  
hevene.  
Geve to us this day our bread  
over other substance,  
And forgif to us our dettis as we  
forgiven to our detters.  
And leed us not into temptation,  
But deliver us from evil.

## XX.

From a MS. on vellum of the  
14th century in the possession  
of J. O. Halliwell, *Rel. Antiq.*,  
i., 38.

Fader . . . . in hevene,  
. . . yd be thi name,  
Come thi kindam,  
Thi wille be don as in hevene  
and in erthe.  
Oure uche dayes bred, geve us  
to day,

And forgeve us oure dettes as we  
 forgiven oure dettours.  
 And lede us not into temptacioun,  
 Bote delyvere us of yvel.

## XXI.

From MS. Gg. IV., 32, Bib.  
 Publ. Cantab., temp. Hen. IV.,  
 1400, *Rel. Antiq.*, i., 159.

Oure Fader in hevene riche,  
 Thin name be iblesced evere  
 iliche,  
 Led us Loverd into thi blisce,  
 Let us nevre thin riche misse.  
 Let us Loverd underfon  
 That thin wille be evere idon  
 Also hit is in hevene  
 In erthe be hit evene,  
 The hevene bred that lasteth ay  
 Gif us Loverd this ilke day,  
 Forgif us Loverd in our bone  
 Al that we haven here misdane,  
 Also wisliche ase we forgiven  
 Hwiles we in this worlde liven  
 Al that us is here misdo  
 And we biseken the thereto,  
 Led us Loverd to non fondinge  
 And sscild us fram alle evel  
 thinge.

## XXII.

English, about 1430, from MS.  
 at Oxford, in John Wilkins'  
 Essay, p. 8, *Mithridates*, ii.,  
 336.

Oure Fadir that art in hevenes,  
 Halewid be thi name,  
 Thi kingdom come to thee,  
 Be thi will don in eerthe as in  
 hevene.  
 Give to us this day oure breed  
 over othere substance,  
 And forgive to us oure dettis as  
 we forgiven oure dettours.  
 And lede us not into temptation,  
 But deliver us from iverl.

*Lichfield.*

## XXIII.

English of 1526, from Tindal's  
 Translation, *Mithridates*, ii.,  
 337.

Our Father which art in heven,  
 Halowed be thy name,  
 Let thy kingdom come,  
 Thy will be fullfilled as well in  
 earth as it is in heven.  
 Geve us this daye our dayly bred,  
 And forgeve us oure dettis as we  
 forgiven oure detters.  
 And leade us not into temptation,  
 But deliver us from evyll.

## XXIV.

South Scotts dialect, Chamberlain,  
 p. 48; *Mithridates*, ii., 338.

Our Fader vhlk ar in hevin,  
 Hallovit be thy name,  
 Thy kingdom cum,  
 Thy uil be doin in erth as it is in  
 hevin.  
 Gif uss yiss day our daily bred,  
 And forgif us our sinnis as we  
 forgif them that sin agains us.  
 And led us not into tentation,  
 Bot delyver us from evil.

## XXV.

Scottish, from Francis Junius'  
*Vader ons*, p. 32; *Mithridates*,  
 ii., 338.

Our Father quhilk art in hea-  
 wine,  
 Sanctifeit be thy name,  
 Thy kingdom cum,  
 Thy will be done in earthe as it  
 is in heawin.  
 Giw us this day our daylik breid,  
 And forgiwe us our debts as ve  
 forgiwe our debtours.  
 And lead us nocht in tentatione,  
 Bot delywer us from ewill.

T. J. BUCKTON.



## THE ANALOGY OF THE APOCALYPSE OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

I SHOULD be glad to offer a few remarks on the transparent fallacies or unfounded assumptions which seem to me to underlie the paper of P. S. D. on the "Analogy of the Apocalypse of the Old and New Testaments."

Dr. Pusey in his work on Daniel (p. 99), remarks: "Lesser questions easily receive their light, or, without injury to the faith, remain for the time obscure, when the eye has once seen the central truth." No one who admits the central truth, that Holy Scripture was given by inspiration of God, that holy men of God spake by the impulse of the Holy Ghost, can for a moment regard John as "a plagiarist in his servile imitation of Daniel." They will consider Daniel in Babylon and John in Patmos as confidential secretaries of the King of kings, who intensified their natural powers to impart to men of their own age, and of all succeeding ages, harmonious descriptions of the kingdom of God under different aspects. Now there can be no concord, no agreement, no harmony of opinion between those who hold fast and those who deny this central truth. Great differences of opinion may exist as to the extent and mode of inspiration among those who heartily and cordially allow the fact. But those who deny or overlook the fact, regard as an egregious falsehood what others hold fast as a central truth. If central truth be clearly seen, "lesser questions easily receive their light, or, without injury to the faith, remain for the time obscure."

Your correspondent's paper is founded wholly on the resolution of two lesser questions, which, after all, are of only subordinate importance. He assumes that John wrote in the time of Nero; I think he wrote in the time of Domitian. According to his interpretation of the Apocalypse, it is absolutely necessary that he should maintain the Neronian date: to acknowledge the Domitianic date is fatal to his case. How, then, can he be a fair, candid, dispassionate judge of the evidence for the earlier or later date? Let the earlier be established, and I see that a fulfilment of the prophecy in the person of Nero accredited the words of the seer to those who lived in his day; and we who live in the more distant future can point to the fulfilment in the nearer, as a type of the full and final accomplishment which still awaits it. Those who have no desire to eliminate the supernatural from the Bible can allow such questions to remain in obscurity; they have nothing essential to gain by settling them one way or the other, but can weigh the critical evidence fairly and impartially.

The question as to the date of Daniel is in nearly the same position. It is imperative for the case of those who ignore inspiration as a fact to describe Daniel as a Maccabean writer of the time of 170 B.C. Any earlier date is absolutely destructive of the theory that the events described are too minute, accurate, and definite to be arrayed under the class of prophecy, and must consequently belong to the

domain of history. Those who acknowledge the predictive character of the book are under no necessity of maintaining that it was written by Daniel in Babylon B.C. 600. As the work has a place in the Jewish canon of Scripture, they cannot admit a lower date than the formation of the canon. But whether the canon was closed B.C. 400, 300, 200, their view of the Book of Daniel remains the same. They can allow this lesser question to remain obscure, for at whatever period the book was written there appears the great and unmistakable prophecy of seventy weeks, which can never be made to terminate with Antiochus Epiphanes, of the destruction of the temple and city, as the effect of the sin of the Jews in cutting off Messiah the Prince.

I cannot wonder that those who deny or question inspiration as a fact should make strenuous endeavours to invalidate the definite character of the Book of Daniel. The real question is, whether prophecy is human or divine? Did God reveal to men, or through men, what they never could have conjectured of their own power or holiness through some inexplicable capacity of anticipating? Does not the whole structure of prophecy lead to the conclusion that there would occur definite and accurate fulfilments known and read of all men? Did not the members of the theocracy receive it as an axiom, "Surely the Lord will do nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets?" (Amos iii. 7.)

I trust I have said enough upon the leading fallacy,—the *πρώτον ψεύδος* of the article in question. If I have been successful in this, lesser questions will easily receive their light; but there are two subordinate points on which I would briefly comment: (1.) The position of the Book of Daniel among the hagiographa. (2.) On the heathen king rising out of the ten horns of the Grecian empire.

P. S. D. speaks of the Book of Daniel being *reduced* by the Jews to the rank of hagiographa! Pray what evidence is there that it ever occupied a higher rank? And if it never occupied a higher rank, how can it be said ever to have been reduced? Let us not argue from our misconceptions, and speak of higher or lower rank, unless it appears evident that the Spirit of God designed any such distinction. The Book of Daniel is found in the same class of writings as the Psalms of David. Both were written by men holding secular offices. The title of prophet and even of prophetess is applied to many who were not enrolled in the prophetic order. The arrangement of the books depends on a clear and intelligible principle. Neither David nor Daniel were formally appointed to the prophetic office, nor exercised it permanently, as was the case with Isaiah and Jeremiah.

Then as to the heathen king rising out of the ten horns of the fourth Grecian empire. Many experiments have been made to apply the visions of Daniel to four empires, ending with Antiochus Epiphanes. How discordant these attempts have been, may be seen by referring to Dr. Pusey's *Daniel*, p. 101. But these different witness agree not together. Four solutions of the difficulty have

been prepared. But the advocates of each agree only in holding the other three to be untenable. I see no reason to reject the exposition generally given by Jewish and Christian commentators alike,—that the fourth world-wide empire was the Roman, which succeeded the Grecian empire of Alexander and his successors. And I hold the more firmly to this view by considering that even if ten kings can be formed out of Alexander and his successors, there is no historical proof that Antiochus, as “the little horn,” overthrew three of these ten.

The analogy and even the verbal parallelisms between Daniel and John may be accounted for by admitting that both were endowed by God with the gift of predicting the kingdom of his Son. It is a sound maxim, “Nihil in scripto quod non prius in Scriptore.” If we regard Daniel and John as writing without supernatural aid, we can give no rational or consistent explanations of their visions. But allow the central truth, that the Spirit of God spake by them, and no serious difficulty remains for the solution of which we cannot afford to wait.

As to the charge of plagiarism, I would ask what prophet is there that does not borrow from his predecessors without acknowledgment? None of them sought his own glory; all were indifferent to their personal fame or credit; they coveted not the distinction of enlarged prescience over their fellows. Each of them adopted the language and sentiments of his predecessors, making such additions and enlargements as the Spirit of Christ within them did signify. Thus Isaiah adopts a prophecy of Micah, and employs the very words of Joel; Jeremiah plagiarizes Obadiah; Ezekiel expands Joel; Nahum refers to Jonah; Zephaniah quotes Habakkuk. What wonder, then, that there should be a close correspondence between Daniel and John, if both wrote by the same supernatural aid, and both described the kingdom of God?

Richmond, S.W., Nov. 14, 1864.

W. WEBSTER.

#### GENESIS IV. 8.

THE Masoretic text of the Hebrew is defective; the words wanting are *לנה דשה*, *Let us go into the field*, which are found in the Samaritan-Hebrew text; in the Samaritan version *הדד לנה* (where I use the corresponding Hebrew characters); in the Syriac *ܠܢܗ ܕܫܗ*; in the Greek *διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον*; in Clemens Romanus (1 ad Corinthos, c. iv.); in Aquila, and in the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem. Even some of the Masorites note an omission here by a circle (°), or by the words *לנה דשה*, *lacuna in medio versus*. Many, on the contrary, admonish the reader *לנה דשה*, *nullam esse lacunam*. These two words, *לנה דשה*, are also omitted by Onkelos, Symmachus, Theodotion, and both the Arabic versions (see Rosenmüller). Besides, the transitive verb *דשה*, *vayomer*, does not mean “he talked,” but “he said:” had Moses designed to say, “he talked,”

he would have used the proper Hebrew word  $\text{דַּבֵּר}$ , *vedibber*, as in Exod. xxxiii. 9, 11, etc.

Michaelis and Dathe have suggested that the word  $\text{דַּבֵּר}$  should be read as "speaking harshly;" but such *conjectural* criticism cannot be tolerated when *positive* evidence exists. This is the same kind of criticism as that of Bentley, when he undertook to amend Horace, Shakspeare, and Milton. How the tribes of Judah and Benjamin (=the Jews) came to lose these two words out of their text is inexplicable; it is clear they were wanting in the time of the Masorites, as in many other instances (Judges xx. 13; 2 Kings xix. 31; Jer. xxxi. 38, etc.). Their preservation is due mainly to the remnant of the ten tribes of Israel,—the Samaritans, whose text, and not the Jewish text, was used in the translation of the Greek Pentateuch.

Lichfield.

T. J. BUCKTON.

### THE ALPHABET OF BARDESANES.

It seems to be desirable to give publicity to an alphabet intended for writing in cipher, or for secret correspondence, and which bears the celebrated name of Bardesanes. This alphabet was communicated to us by Dr. W. W. Wright, the curator of the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, where he discovered it. As he had not investigated its peculiarities we have endeavoured to do so, and will here state the results.

The alphabet is written in the old Syriac character, and on the surface of it is merely the substitution of one letter for another. We reproduce it in Hebrew letters:—

א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת  
ט ח ז ו נ ד ג כ א צ פ ע ס ה מ ל כ י ת ש ר ק

To a certain extent we have here simply an inverted order, but if we divide the two sets into groups, we shall find they stand thus:—

$$4+1+4+4+1+4+(2+2)$$

$$4+1+4+4+1+4+(2+2)$$

The first four in the first line and the second four in the second line are alike, but in the reverse order: the second four of the first line is like the first four in the second line, but in the reverse order: the same is true of the third group of four in the first line, compared with the fourth in the lower series; and it also applies to the fourth set of four in the top row compared with the third in the lower row. The last four may be treated either as 4 or as 2+2; if as four, the upper set is the converse of the lower one; if as 2+2, the inversion is by pairs, as at the outset: the first pair in the upper row is the converse of the second pair in the lower row; and the second pair in the top row is the converse of the first pair in the bottom row. Lastly, the first  $\text{ה}$  in the upper row has  $\text{נ}$  for its equivalent; and the  $\text{נ}$  in the upper row has  $\text{ה}$  for its equivalent, where we see the

process of inversion still continued. The whole alphabet may now stand thus:—

א	ב	ג	ד	ה	ו	ז	ח	ט	י	כ	ל	מ	נ	ס	ע	פ	צ
ש	ח	ז	ו	נ	ד	ג	ב	א	צ	פ	ע	ס	ה	מ	ל	כ	י
									ק	ר	ש	ת					
									ת	ש	ר	ק					

Viewed in relation to numerical power this alphabet is very curious. By adding together the units of each line, this is seen. Thus א=1, and ט=9, or 1+9=10; so ב+ז=10, and so of the two next. נ+ד=55, or more properly 50+5; strike off the cipher, and 5+5=10. The second pair of fours are exactly like the first, ו+ו=10, etc.; the third pair of fours added in the same way give hundreds: י+י=100, and so on. The ו and ו have to be treated as before. The next pair of fours give hundreds again; thus ס+מ give 60+40=100; which it will be seen answers to ו+ו, or 6+4=10, and this indicates a further relation between the groups, viz., that the first *pair* of fours is parallel to the second, and the third to the fourth; strike off the ciphers from the last two pairs of fours, and they give the same results as the first two pairs, viz., 10; but ciphers are nothing, and therefore the key to the alphabet thus far is unity, or 1. For the last four letters of the alphabet there is no difficulty. ק+ר+ש+ת=1000 by adding all the top row, and the same for the bottom row; now  $\frac{1000}{1000}=1$ . Or add the first two in the top row to the letters beneath them, and you have 1000. So of the second pairs. Taken singly we get only 500, and that in each case; for ק+ת=500, ר+ש=500, etc., or  $\frac{500}{500}=1$ . It seems, however, that 1000 was meant to be the sum, and as ciphers are nothing, we come back again to 1.

Other relations and properties may very probably be discovered in these combinations, but their investigation must be left to others. It is impossible to affirm that Bardesanes, the Gnostic, actually devised this arrangement, but it will perhaps appear to embody mysteries sufficient to justify us in at least referring it to a Gnostic origin. No harm can be done by adding, in reference to the mystical features of this alphabet, that the units of the last four letters as numerals stand thus:—

$$\begin{aligned} 4+3, 2+1 &= 7+3, \\ 1+2, 3+4 &= 3+7. \end{aligned}$$

The wonderfully sacred character of 3 and 7 is sufficiently known. Thus we have Unity, Trinity, Septenary.

B. H. C.

## GENESIS VI. 3.

THE true translation of this passage has been a matter of doubt. The Authorized Version rendering, "My spirit shall not always strive with man," is plainly inconsistent with the general tendency of the Pentateuch, and indeed of all the Old Testament canon. It is altogether a Christian sentiment, dating from the day whereon the Son of God left his disciples the gift of the Comforter, "even the Spirit of truth." Besides, such a translation is inappropriate to the context. The same may be said of another rendering of the verb  $\pi\tau$  that has been proposed, viz., "to bear active rule." As the word does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament, Hebraists have thought themselves at liberty to select any meaning they chose for it.

But all uncertainty with regard to the signification of the word has now been set at rest. In this, as in many other cases, the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria has thrown a flood of light upon sacred criticism. The translation of the passage by the Septuagint, Vulgate, Syriac, and Arabic versions has been fully confirmed. Let us first consider the evidence alluded to. Sargon, in one of his inscriptions, describes the building of a palace of his at Calah in the following terms: "At this time the palace of palm-wood at Calah, which Assur-izir-pal, a prince that went before me, had built in former days, with regard to this palace—*ussu-su ul-dunnu'u-va eli du'unni epkari cizir sadi ul-sursuda*—its foundations did not remain, and over the *bed* (compare  $\text{בֵּד}$ , 2 Kings ii. 19, and  $\text{בֵּד}$ ) of earth an enclosure of stone was not laid." The meaning of *dunnu'u* and *du'unni* here is quite clear and certain, and thus fixes the interpretation of the corresponding Hebrew  $\pi\tau$ .<sup>d</sup> We must therefore translate the verse under consideration, "And Jehovah said, My breath ('spirit,' besides being of Latin extraction, is likely to produce a wrong impression) shall not remain, or abide (*καταμείνη*, *permanebit*) with man (Adâm) for ever, for he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years." This makes explanation easy. The passage is Jehovistic, and refers us back to the Jehovistic chapters ii.—iv., which relate how man (Adâm) was created out of the dust of the ground, and originally intended by God to live for ever ( $\text{עוֹלָם}$ ) (Gen. iii. 22, 23) while he continued sinless and pure, for Jehovah had "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, so that man (Adâm) became a living soul." It was in consequence of the vital principle being the very breath of Jehovah, that the lives of the patriarchs recorded in chap. v. were of so long duration. But on account of their wickedness, of their misspending

<sup>d</sup> This might have been done long ago had Hebraists but recognized a plain-enough fact—that  $\pi\tau$  is a derivative from  $\pi\tau$  or rather the primitive root of  $\pi\tau$ . Now  $\pi\tau$  is a "pedestal," as in Cant. v. 15; Exod. xxvi. 19, etc.; and indeed the Authorized Version has translated the word "foundations" in Job xxxviii. 6. This should have been a sufficient warrant for the correctness of the translations by the Septuagint and other ancient versions.

the long opportunity for good allowed them, God declared that his breath (*i. e.*, the vital principle) should not remain with the sons of Adâm for ever (עַדְעַד). Now, "for ever" in Hebrew idiom merely meant a long indefinite period, as, *e. g.*, in Gen. xvii. 8. So the ages of mankind were to be shortened; for men, though endued with the breath of God, are still but flesh, "which is as grass," that "to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven;" nevertheless their days shall still be prolonged to an hundred and twenty years.

This will not, I trust, be the only textual difficulty in the Bible cleared up by the cuneiform records.

Bath.

A. SAYCE.

### FISHES IN THE SEA OF GALILEE.

IN the January Number of *The Journal of Sacred Literature* for 1864, a remark is made by Mr. Barham, that "It is strange that no traveller in Palestine, so far as I am aware, has yet ascertained with scientific precision what fishes actually inhabit this celebrated lake." Whatever Mr. Tristram may bring to light as to the fish of that lake, after his recent expedition to the Holy Land, will, no doubt, be most interesting and instructive. I have a copy of the *Observationes Petri Bellonii*, who travelled in Palestine during the years from 1546 to 1549. Of the Lake of Gennesareth he says: "Haud procul inde digressi, ad maris sive lacus Tiberiadis littus pervenimus, in quo Cyprini, Lucii, Tinca, et Chevesnes Gallorum, sive Squalo Romanorum et Venetorum, capiuntur." Thus proving that he saw them. He then mentions some vegetables which he saw: "Toto illo die per steriles agros iter fecimus, exceptis humidioribus quibusdam locis, quibus incolæ Colocasias, Brassicas capitatas, Betas crassa radice præditas, Cepas, Allia et paucas Musæ stirpes colunt."

"Pagi," (alluding to Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin,) "illi nunc a Judæis incoluntur, qui circum lacum passim ædificârunt, et ob piscationes istic constitutas, loca antea deserta, incolis frequentiora et cultiora reddiderunt."

I am sorry to say the title-page is wanting, but the dedication bears date 1553. The above extract will shew that some attention was paid to, and enquiry made what were, the inhabitants of the Lake Gennesaret three hundred years ago.

Bishop Wearmouth, Sept. 1, 1864.

RICHARD SHIPSEY.

### EXPOSITION OF ACTS II. 42.

WE are so continually impressed by some churchmen with the erroneousness of our authorized rendering of Acts ii. 42, which, they say, should be "*the bread, the prayers,*" that I was surprised to find in Bengel ad loc. and ad v. 46, "Significatur victus quotidianus cum quo persæpe conjuncta erat Eucharistiæ administratio." Such a

\* *Obser. P. Bellonii*, p. 146.

comparatively low view led me to further enquiries, and it did seem odd that in ver. 46 we have simply *ἄρτον* without the article. But if the Holy Eucharist must have the article *propter excellentiam*, why not there? On looking more closely at this ver. 42, the use of the article seems to be otherwise explicable. As it was prefixed to "teaching of the apostles," on which—from its being placed first—the emphasis was evidently to be laid, there followed as subsidiary their (1) mutual intercourse; (2) breaking of bread; (3) prayers. But as these last were also referred to the apostles, the article was used to place them in close conjunction with the "teaching." In fact, as the clause containing "teaching" or "doctrine," is the only one that precedes "apostles," to be consistent they ought to render, "and in the fellowship, and in the breaking of the bread, and in the prayers." Nay more; in ver. 37 we ought to have, "they were pricked in the heart." Moreover, why do we find in Luke xxii. 21, "the table," and why in ver. 19 only *ἄρτος* before consecration, and in ver. 20 τὸ ποτήριον also before consecration? Again, in Matt. xxvi. 26, we find τὸν ἄρτον before the consecration; and in Mark xiv. 22, 23, ἄρτον and ποτήριον. I could go farther and shew that, *e.g.* Codex Alexandrinus has in the passage of St. Matthew the article before *ἄρτον*; Cod. Vat., Cod. Eph. resc., Cod. Benæ, Cod. Sinaiticus, not so; while Cod. Vat. and Cod. Sinaiticus alone omit the article before ποτήριον. This shews the lax usage of the article before common nouns under certain circumstances, and we contend that the force of the article in Acts ii. 42 has been greatly exaggerated, where it gives κοινωνία, κλάσει τ. α., and προσευχαίς a definite status, but subordinated to ἀποστολῶν. They might all be preceded by "their" instead of "the" (as "heart" in ver. 37 in the Authorized Version), without any derogation to the sense.

H. F. W.

---

#### "A BRIEF INSTRUCTION," ETC.

I AM anxious to trace the author of a small Nonconformist volume now before me: *A Brief Instruction in the Worship of God, and Discipline of the Churches of the New Testament, by way of Question and Answer; with an explication and confirmation of those answers* (printed 1667). My copy has the signature of "John Clare, Helpstone," *i.e.*, the poet, and seems to have been one of his books when he was "all unknown to fame."

C.

---

#### "DEVOTIONS" IN ACTS XVII. 23.

Σεβασματα in Acts xvii. 23, English Version. "Devotions" is, no doubt, a general term, like Fr., "objets de religion," and includes even altars.

X.

---



## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Discussions on the Gospels.* In Two Parts. Part I. On the Language employed by our Lord and his disciples. Part II. On the Original language of St. Matthew's Gospel, and on the origin and authenticity of the Gospels. By ALEXANDER ROBERTS, D.D. Second edition, revised and enlarged. London: Macmillan and Co.

WE are glad to find that the favourable opinion we expressed when we reviewed this work two years and a half since, has been confirmed by the studious part of the public. At the same time we must congratulate the learned author not only as having produced a useful and successful book, but as having won other laurels, the symbol of which is the D.D. appended to his name. Amid the vast strife of authorship which now prevails, if failure is less dishonourable than when so few competed, success is more honourable because so many enter upon the course. In the present instance we see an author who took up with the idea of the minority, but who has developed it with so much skill, perseverance, and ability, has pleaded for it with so much earnestness, and has supported it by so many facts and arguments, that he has added to the number of its adherents, and has made it respected by those who still think it wrong.

If our readers will turn to our number for July, 1862, they will see an outline of Dr. Roberts's work. To the plan as there described, the seventh chapter in the present edition has been added. This new chapter is on the authenticity and credibility of the Gospels, and is based upon the recent life of Jesus by M. Renan: it contains an application of our author's conclusions to the legendary and mythical hypotheses as to the origin of the Gospels; and the truly historical character of the evangelic narratives is supported by it. The chapter is a very important one, and will be found of real utility in the present conflict. It is highly satisfactory to see in how many ways, and by what powerful reasoning, the old faith is defensible. There is, in the chapter we have referred to, a note on the nationality of St. Luke. His name, and other considerations, have favoured the traditional opinion that the third evangelist was a Gentile; in particular, much reliance has been placed upon Col. iv. 11, where St. Paul mentions some as "of the circumcision," and *afterwards*, in verse 14, names Luke. The author removes the difficulty by alleging that wherever "they of the circumcision" are spoken of, the allusion is not to Jews as such, but to a party among the Jews, whether within or without the Church. The expression occurs in Acts x. 45; xi. 2; Gal. ii. 12; Col. iv. 11; Tit. i. 10. The arguments by which our author's view is supported are given at length in pp. 167—172. We can only say that a fair case is made out, and enough done to shake implicit faith in the common notion. We wish, however, that there had been an attempt

to shew the relation of the words, "they of the circumcision," in Gal. ii. 12, and the words, "and the other Jews," in the verse following. We suppose it would be argued that these two expressions are not synonymous, but that they clearly point to a distinction among the Jews. Is this view supported by extraneous evidence in Jewish or other writers? Justin makes Trypho the Jew say, "I am a Hebrew of the circumcision." So far as the words are concerned, "the circumcision," or "they of the circumcision," mean no more than "the circumcised," just as "they of the captivity" are "the captives." And yet it may be true that the words denoted a party, just as "Baptists" does among ourselves: all Christians are baptized, but not all are "Baptists;" so all Jews were circumcised, but all may not have called themselves "the circumcision." However the question may be settled, and however it may affect St. Luke, we are glad to find our author mentioning that evangelist's minute acquaintance with Jewish matters. Renan and others, by some strange illusion, have said Luke did not know Hebrew; but this opinion vanishes before the idioms which he introduces, and other facts.

No doubt the head and front of the volume before us is its theory as to the language which our Lord employed in habitual converse. The author admits a Hebraistic vernacular, as all intelligent writers must; but he pleads in favour of the prevalence of Greek to a far greater degree than modern critics generally have supposed. He does not, however, go so far as Dominic Diodati of Naples, whose book, *De Christo Græce loquente Exercitatio*, was designed to prove that Greek or the Hellenistic language was native and vernacular to all the Jews, and to our Lord and his apostles. This remarkable book appeared at Naples in 1767 (8vo, pp. xvi, 204), and was dedicated to the empress of Russia, Catherine II. The original is excessively rare; but Dr. Dobbin republished the book with a preface. Apart from this preface we prefer the original, from which Dr. Dobbin's edition diverged a little,—unless the copies differ, as we suppose they must. The question of the language used generally by our Lord is important, because if he regularly spoke Aramaic, we only have a translation of his words: if, however, he usually spoke Greek, we have in many cases the very words he used. To his former proofs of the gravity of this question, Dr. Roberts has added some striking passages from the essays of Sir James Stephen, where allusion is made to such expressions as "This is my body," and "everlasting punishment;" where everything turns upon the Greek words. We regret that space forbids us now to enlarge, but we must return to the subject hereafter. Meanwhile we desire to express in strong terms our approval of a work which has upon it the stamp of genuineness and originality, which is characterized by deep thought and broad learning, and which may render real and lasting service to honest, intelligent, and inquiring minds in this which Scherer calls "the crisis of Protestantism."

---

*Daniel the Prophet.* Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford, with copious notes. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford: J. H. and J. Parker. London: Rivingtons. 1864.

It has not seldom happened that the Maccabean date, and consequently pseudonymous character of the Book of Daniel, have been of late taken for granted. This is a mistake, and no critic has a right to say more than that in his opinion the objections brought against the book are stronger than those which have been adduced in its favour. One result of the confidence which we blame has been to call forth a series of works in defence of the genuine and authentic character of the book, which at least demonstrate that much may be said on its behalf. It is not long since we noticed the volumes of Mr. Boyle and Mr. Walter, and now we have before us those of Dr. Pusey and the Rev. J. M. Fuller. To the former of these we shall now briefly call attention.

Dr. Pusey states that his work was planned as his contribution against the scepticism which the *Essays and Reviews* promoted. He shews the peculiar features of the Book of Daniel, and traces the objections to it to the rejection of its supernatural elements. Hence he has felt that these were the very elements which it was most necessary to develope and vindicate. It is quite unnecessary for us to touch upon Dr. Pusey's strictures upon the leading critics of the free-thought party, nor to say that in his conservatism he goes beyond ourselves; and yet we thoroughly sympathize with him in the earnestness and zeal with which he maintains and upholds the divine inspiration and authority of Holy Writ. His lectures are most elaborate productions, and on the ground of research and patient industry alone, are worth as much as any German book upon the subject; they are equal to any such also on other and higher grounds. The first lecture takes up a number of miscellaneous questions, including those which turn upon linguistic features, and we may safely say that they are handled with a scholarship which is far above the average of merit. We are inclined to think these philological objections will not be able much longer to hold their ground; they are already dropping away one after another, as we learn more of the facts and times with which Daniel associates us. Several of the lectures are occupied with detailed vindications of the genuineness of the prophecies of Daniel, and of the correctness of the traditional interpretation. Other lines of defence run in other directions—the time when the canon was closed, scriptural allusions, historical, doctrinal, and other matters. The book is, therefore, strictly lectures on Daniel, and not simply a commentary upon it. A vast mass of learned notes appears at the foot of the pages, and more than sixty pages of further notes come at the close. As a storehouse of what has been said against, and of what may be advanced in behalf of, the Book of Daniel, Dr. Pusey's volume is of much value. There are interpretations adopted by him to which we cannot assent; there are

arguments advanced by him of which we do not feel the force; and there are other circumstantialia with which we cannot agree; but for all that, we regard this work as a very important contribution to our meagre stock of good English books upon the Old Testament. There can be no doubt that the author's labour has been most conscientiously performed, and he has had recourse to every available source of information. In our day the very stones "cry out," and Dr. Pusey has gone to the stones of Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia, and interrogated them: at any rate he has questioned those who know what the stones have to say. He has ranged over an immense field of ancient and of modern literature so successfully, that there seem to be very few matters of importance which he has overlooked. No candid critic can sneer down a work of this sort; if it is to be nullified, it must be refuted; and if it is to be refuted, it can only be less by starting new difficulties, than by driving our author from a very strong entrenchment of facts. On the whole, this is a most seasonable, serviceable, and important work, and one for which we desire a large measure of success.

---

*Kaye University Prize. An Essay on the Authenticity of the Book of Daniel.* By the Rev. J. M. FULLER, M.A. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy. 1864.

SIR ISAAC NEWTON's view of the authorship of Daniel is as follows: "The Book of Daniel is a collection of papers written at several times. The six last chapters contain prophecies written at several times by Daniel himself: the six first are a collection of historical papers written by others. The fourth chapter is a decree of Nebuchadnezzar. The first chapter was written after Daniel's death; for the author saith, that Daniel continued to the first year of Cyrus; that is, to his first year over the Persians and Medes, and third year over Babylon. And, for the same reason, the fifth and sixth chapters were also written after his death; for they end with these words, 'So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian.' Yet these words might be added by the collector of the papers, whom I take to be Ezra." The common opinion is that the book was wholly the work of Daniel, who wrote the historical part, embodying in it genuine documents, and indited the prophetic portions. A third view is, that the book was not compiled till long after Daniel, and even Ezra, and was the work of some one about the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Mr. Fuller defends its proper genuineness and authenticity, especially in opposition to those who follow Hitzig in placing it between 170 and 164 B.C.

Mr. Fuller commences with a preliminary chapter, in which he discusses some of the more general questions, and states some of the grounds on which he intends to proceed. In his second chapter he mentions certain external objections, namely, the canonical position of the book, the *argumenta à silentio*, and philological phenomena; the

first of these is examined in this chapter, and a reasonable explanation is offered. The third chapter treats of the second class of objections, which are really not formidable. The fourth chapter deals with the more minute questions of language; and without being very profound, is sufficiently so for ordinary purposes. In common with Dr. Pusey, he testifies to the value of an article on the subject which appeared in this *Journal* in 1859, and he makes a judicious use of the copious materials which are now accessible from other sources. The fifth chapter investigates at length, and with much learning and clearness, the first of the internal objections, that from asserted historical inaccuracies. Both here and in Dr. Pusey's work it is made quite plain that the evidence in favour of Daniel, both on philological and on historical grounds, is much stronger than was suspected a few years since. The sixth chapter treats of the miracles, which furnish the second internal objection. The chapter following defends and investigates the prophecies, which supply another objection. This chapter is a very well written one, and concludes with some remarks on ethical features which have been challenged. The eighth chapter contains a display of testimonies in favour of Daniel, from a variety of sources. The work is not so minute and specific as that of Dr. Pusey, but the two supplement each other, and may be placed alongside of those already mentioned by Messrs. Boyle and Walter. The four furnish a body of evidence in favour of the Book of Daniel which cannot be ignored or treated lightly. They are very different in many of their features, and are in sundry respects not all of the same merit, but taken together, they embody nearly all that need be said to place the authenticity of this book on at least as high a level as that of any other book in the Old Testament. Mr. Fuller, with whom we have now chiefly to do, deserves the prize which has been awarded to him, and the thanks of all who are interested in a subject which ought to interest us all. It is now abundantly demonstrated that until Porphyry (about 300 A.D.) assailed this book, it was never called in question, and that its substantially genuine and authentic character was not questioned by either Jews or Christians till the last century. The attack which had first been made by a heathen, was renewed by a deist, and was at last adopted by some of the rationalists. Since then doubts have been entertained by some who are not rationalists in the ordinary sense. On the other hand, the evidences in favour of the book reach back into Old Testament times, are very strong in the New Testament, and extend over the whole history of the Church. That there should be difficulties connected with a book professedly written so many centuries before Christ, and in a land which may be said to be only now opening up to us, is to be expected. The wonder is, that such a ponderous mass of evidence can be brought in its favour. Its miracles, and above all, its wonderful predictions, are the true reason for the opposition which has been made to it.

---

*Scholia on Passages of the Old Testament, by Mar Jacob, Bishop of Edessa.* Now first edited in the original Syriac, with an English translation and notes, by GEORGE PHILLIPS, President of Queen's College, Cambridge. London: Williams and Norgate.

WE are happy to receive this fresh contribution from the Syriac stores now laid up in the British Museum. Mar Jacob was a Syrian of the seventh century, and was distinguished by the activity of his life and his studious habits. His writings were numerous and varied, comprising both original works and translations. Among the original works we find a chronicon, sundry ecclesiastical writings, hymns, scholia, the first recorded Syriac grammar, and miscellaneous epistles and treatises. He is said to have died in A.D. 708. Ten or twelve MSS. in the British Museum contain portions of his works, and more may be found at Oxford and Paris. Very little of these remains has been published, and on this account the learned world will be the more thankful to Professor Phillips for this specimen of an author so celebrated in the East. The Scholia are twenty-four in number, and consist of notes upon portions of Genesis, Exodus, Deuteronomy, 1 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings. Those here presented were no doubt a selection from more of the same character. Each one commences with an intimation of its number in the series, and of its subject, but the first of these titles does not correctly state the subject of the scholium to which it is prefixed, probably because the copyist only quoted a part of what Jacob had written under that head. The volume may, or rather must, therefore, be regarded as made up of excerpts from the Scholia of Jacob, some of the extracts being complete scholia, and others not.

The translator's opinion of the passages he has copied and rendered into English is thus expressed:—

"They prove that Jacob must have been well acquainted with the letter of the Scriptures; and the spiritual applications he often makes of the incidents of Bible history, whilst they bear witness to his earnest piety, and the deep reverence he had for the sacred volume, shew us also how full it appeared to his mind of that which makes a man 'wise unto salvation.' At the same time it is right for me to state, that I do not hold myself responsible for any of the views and opinions expressed in the Scholia. Whilst, however, I think it due to myself to make this remark, and although I do not expect that the kind of exposition found in several instances in these Scholia will be deemed in harmony with the criticism which is current in the present day, yet I consider that they are deeply interesting as a specimen of Scripture exegesis, prevalent at the time in which our author lived, and in that branch of the Church of which he was a bishop, and which has ever reckoned him as standing in the foremost rank amongst its scholars."

It will be superfluous for us to make any remark upon these observations; we quite coincide in them, and deem them a fair and judicious representation of the case. There is nothing very profound or extraordinary in the notes; but some of them are nevertheless very curious, and all of them will repay perusal. We ought not to be indifferent to praiseworthy efforts like this to bring before us the repre-

sentative of a far distant and ancient Church, and to let us see for ourselves both what and how he taught. The Syriac text is printed by Mr. Watts, and will serve as a nice manual for a college course, where Syriac must now be taught as well without vowel-points as with them. The translation is carefully made, and the rendering is given in good readable English. Mr. Phillips is an old Syriac student, and it affords us much pleasure to meet him in the editorial department. We hope he will be encouraged to give us another volume of the same kind as this, which we beg to commend to the favourable attention of our readers.

---

*Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament.* By C. F. KEIL, D.D., and F. DELITZSCH, D.D. Vol. II. Translated by Rev. JAMES MARTIN, B.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

IN our Number for July last we noticed the first volume of this useful work, and it will be hardly necessary for us now to add much to what we then said. Nevertheless, we have looked more closely into the work, in consequence of which we have arrived at the conclusion, that although in one respect it is capable of improvement, it contains so large a mass of really solid and useful matter, that it deserves a stronger commendation than we gave to it. Its historical and topographical notes, and its philological explanations, are very valuable, and on these grounds, as well as because of the excellent spirit which pervades it, we earnestly advise English students to procure it. We have found even less in the second volume to take exception to than we found in the first. It is beyond our power to express sufficiently our sense of the debt we owe to the Messrs. Clark, whose sagacity in selecting, and enterprise in producing, the noble series of books fitted for our times, chiefly those which they have brought out during the last two or three years, is something extraordinary. Their volumes come out almost with the regularity of the Almanac, where series are concerned, and they are not only marvels of cheapness, but are now almost invariably translated and edited with judgment and ability. The volume on the Pentateuch, now in our hands, extends from Exod. xii. to the end of Leviticus.

---

*Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, specially designed and adapted for the use of Ministers and Students.* From the German of G. V. LECHLER, D.D., and K. GEROK. Edited by J. P. LANGE, D.D. Translated by Rev. PATON J. GLOAG. Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

WE have also described the plan of this work in a previous number, and expressed a general opinion in its favour. It is a combination of critical and other elements, presenting us with the text and "exegetical remarks," followed by "dogmatical and ethical thoughts," and "homiletical hints." As the title states, it is a book for students and ministers, but we do not know why it and the rest of the series should

not be extensively useful among religious and intelligent laymen. The second volume completes the work, containing chapters xiii. to xxviii.

---

*German Rationalism, in its rise, progress, and decline, in relation to theologians, scholars, poets, philosophers, and the people: a contribution to the Church history of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.* By Dr. K. R. HAGENBACH. Edited and translated by Rev. W. L. GAGE and Rev. J. H. W. STUCKENBERG. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THE name of Dr. Hagenbach is already well known in this country, and the value of his *History of Doctrines* is so generally appreciated, that the way is prepared for a very favourable reception of the volume now in our hands. Its editors and translators have reduced the size of it by presenting it in the form of an abridgement. They have left out such things as seemed to be of small interest to this nation and America. As it now stands, the work consists of twenty-four chapters, of which the first three are more general, and the remainder devoted to special topics and persons. It exhibits the results of a vast range of reading and research, and brings before us a wonderful array of names and of facts. For the most part, it naturally relates to Germany, but there are occasional references to other countries. The closing chapter is on the rise of the Protestant spirit in the Roman Catholic Church during the past and present centuries, and contains various matters pertaining to France, etc. In the fifth chapter also, on the pioneers of rationalism, we have something about both French and English celebrities. The remainder of the work is mainly occupied with German critics, philosophers, and others; chapters are devoted to Herder, Kant, Schiller, Jacobi, Fichte, Schleiermacher, Hegel and his successors, and to a host of others. The work is one of unusual interest, as exhibiting the extraordinary mental activity of our Teutonic cousins during the last century and a half. It portrays the action and reaction, the development and variation, the flourishing and waning of thought in many aspects. As a contribution to the history of modern religious and philosophical opinion, it is invaluable. And now that such earnest efforts are making to revive and propagate some of the doctrines of old German rationalism among ourselves, we cannot but regard the book as very seasonable. As a record of the variations of rationalism it may serve to encourage us, by shewing that rationalism wants that one element of stability which is essential to lasting success.

---

*The Early Scottish Church. The Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, from the First to the Twelfth Century.* By the Rev. THOMAS MC LAUCHLAN, M.A., F.S.A.S. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

THIS is a very good book. The author has given it an air of thoroughness and of originality, which will justify its claim to a permanent place in literature. It is not so much a compilation from readily acces-



sible works, as a new draft upon the ancient sources. The difficulty of satisfactorily elucidating the early history of Scotland is very great indeed, but our author has manfully grappled with it as none but a Scot could be expected to do, and the result is every way gratifying; as much so, that is, as any similar investigation in regard to Southern Britain. All the old legends are mentioned, and fairly and honestly dealt with, and every genuine shred of history is carefully noted. As time advances, the records become more clear and precise, and Mr. Mc Lauchlan has woven out of them a continuous narrative, which will be found both instructive and interesting. We do not now undertake to analyze the work, but we are able to bear witness to its genuine character. Sometimes the author may seem not credulous enough for a historian, but this is a good fault, and one which men are beginning to reckon among the virtues. The style is direct and intelligible, and the volume is very well printed. We have no doubt it will command attention.

---

*Lectures upon the whole Epistle of St. Paul to the Philippians, delivered in St. Peter's Church, in Oxford.* By HENRY AIRAY, D.D.

*A Commentary upon the Epistle of St. Paul written to the Colossians.* Preached by THOMAS CARTWRIGHT, B.D. Edinburgh: James Nichol. London: Nisbet.

THESE two works are in one quarto volume, and have been edited by Mr. Grosart for Nichol's series of commentaries. The volume is exceedingly well printed, and its "getting up" is handsome. The editor also has done his part with his wonted zeal and accuracy, as may be seen by reference to his introductions, etc. Airay was a divine who flourished in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign, and in that of James I. He died in 1616 (Shakspeare's year) as provost of Queen's College, Oxford. He was eminent in his day, and especially distinguished himself as an expositor, but there is really not much known of him. As Mr. Grosart says, this commentary is his one abiding monument. It is full of holy thought, and good service has been rendered by its reproduction, as it was a scarce book.

The Commentary on the Colossians is a yet scarcer book. Its author was the famous Cartwright, whose Puritan and thorough Protestant tendencies have made him almost as famous as his great learning and talents. He was an extraordinary man, and those who do not sympathize with him in the polemical school, may learn good from him if they will read this brief commentary. The volume is exceedingly cheap, although very valuable.

---

*Directorium Pastorale.* ("Principles and Practice of Pastoral Work in the Church of England.") By the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT. London: Rivingtons. 1864.

A VERY nice looking volume, overflowing with hints and advices upon the great practical work of which it treats. The author is what would be

called a High Churchman, and some of his views may possibly not be accepted by all; but apart from exceptional details, we believe the work to be well fitted to convey a very large amount of instruction. The young clergyman, and even the parish priest who has been long at his work, may find in it what will profit. It differs from the older works upon the same subject, just as our times differ from those in which the said books were written. Mr. Blunt represents the actual phase of thorough churchmanship, and his views of principles and duties are in accordance therewith. His book is therefore a book for our times. He treats of the nature of the pastoral office, of the relation of the pastor to God and to his flock, of the ministry of the Word and sacraments, and the visitation of the sick, of pastoral converse and guidance of schools, lay co-operation, parochial institutions and festivals, miscellaneous responsibilities, etc. There is also an appendix of sundry matters. We do not accord with every expression we find, but we believe the book will be very useful to the clergy, and to them we commend it.

---

*The Holy Bible.* With Notes and Introductions by CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Genesis and Exodus. London: Rivingtons. 1864.

WE frankly confess to a difficulty in noticing this volume. On the one hand, we desire to do it justice, and to give due prominence to our approval of much that it contains. On the other hand, as impartial critics who never indiscriminately praise any author, we feel required to say that there are features in this work which we do not feel satisfied with. Every page bears witness to the piety, faith, and earnest zeal of the author,—shews that he is not disposed to shun the difficulties he encounters, and indicates extensive reading and research. Every column bristles with the names of fathers, modern critics and divines, and many of the extracts from them are very edifying and instructive, as the case may be. But we are quite unable to adopt the principles of interpretation which the writers quoted often exemplify, because we cannot accept a mystical, allegorical, metaphorical, or spiritual meaning for the simplest facts in patriarchal history. To our minds these things are strongly objectionable, and while we are willing to see them adduced as literary curiosities, or as mere examples of the way in which this and that text has been treated, we must say we cannot accept them as in any true sense fair and legitimate exposition. We fear that the reproduction of so much that modern critics and modern educated tastes generally object to, will not promote the great cause which Canon Wordsworth has so much at heart. Nothing in the world has done more to create a revulsion to sound Scriptural teaching than the unnatural and non-natural senses put upon Holy Scripture. No possible amount of pious intention can neutralize the effect of seemingly puerile ideas. We are not now speaking of doctrine, but of simple interpretation so called. There is another point: Dr. Wordsworth has, by some strange fatality, sometimes sinned against the

first elements of philological science. We will only give a single example from note on Exod. xxviii. 37; "The mitre, *mitsnepheth*, from *tsanaph*, to wind round (Gesen., 501), or it may be from *metsach* the forehead, from *matsach* to shine." There is not a single Hebrew scholar in the world who would propose the second derivation. The gravity of these objections is such that we feel it our bounden duty to point them out. In any later edition some of them may be removed and others modified, but we do earnestly hope that the usefulness of a great project may not be marred throughout, by adherence to exegetical and philological principles which are rapidly becoming effete, and are already reckoned with the past by the most distinguished writers of the orthodox party abroad and at home. Every attempt to throw back the age will fail. The Bible can and must be expounded on intelligent Christian principles, and this is true of no part of it more than of the Pentateuch. Now-a-days our ointment must have no fly in it.

---

*The English Bible: containing the Old and New Testaments, according to the Authorized Version: newly divided into paragraphs; with concise introductions to the several books, and notes illustrative of the chronology, history and geography of the Sacred Scriptures; containing the most remarkable variations of the ancient versions, and the chief results of modern criticism. London: printed for the Editor, and sold by Simpkin, Marshall and Co.*

THIS work must have cost an immense amount of time and labour. The editor has endeavoured to throw upon the Authorized Version as much light as possible, by a variety of means. He has divided the text into paragraphs, and has given two columns of each page to the illustrative notes. These notes include marginal readings, and parallel passages printed in full, as well as an extensive selection of extracts from various writers. The extracts in question relate to a great number of matters, and supply a ready and compendious explanation of such points as require elucidation. Introductory notices are prefixed to the respective books, and various historical and chronological details are supplied. The poetical portions are printed in parallelisms, so as to exhibit their structure to the eye. Besides these, various parts of the New Testament have also been printed in parallelisms, not because they are properly speaking poetical, but because such an arrangement appears to make their meaning plainer. The last speech of Stephen is printed in this manner, as also are various discourses of our Lord and his apostles, and most of the Epistle to the Romans.

Where the particulars are so very numerous, and everything exhibited in the most summary form, no verbal description can suffice to give an adequate representation. A glance at the pages is, however, enough to convince any one of the great diligence, extensive research, and skill of the editor. It is much to be desired that a book affording so many advantages should find a place in every intelligent household library. Ministers and Sunday-school teachers may profit by its hints

and information, and the student will often have his labour of investigation lightened by it; indeed there are few who may not consult it to their gain. The English text is clearly and accurately printed, and the marginal notes, although in a smaller type, are quite legible. Some of the more important variations of the Vatican MS. are ingeniously represented by a change of type in the text. We desire earnestly to recommend a book which on so many accounts is fitted to facilitate the intelligent perusal of those "Holy Scriptures which are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."

---

*Catalogi Codicum Manuscriptorum Bibliotheca Bodleianæ pars sexta. Codices Syriacos, Carshunicos, Mendæos, complectens.* Confecit R. PAYNE SMITH, A.M. Oxonii: E. Typographæ Clarendoniano. MDCCCLXIV.

THIS handsome volume contains a carefully prepared catalogue of MSS. in the Syriac character deposited in the Bodleian library. It comprises two hundred and five articles, five pages of beautifully executed facsimiles, and appropriate indexes. The editor, who is well known as a Syriac scholar, and who is sub-librarian at the Bodleian, has performed his part in a very admirable manner, and the learned world will be glad to receive from his hands so minute a description and account of the documents enumerated. The MSS. consist of copies of portions of the Scriptures or of the whole, liturgical works of various kinds, hymns, homilies and other theological miscellanies, and sundry lexicons, grammatical and other compilations. Some of the MSS. are of considerable interest and antiquity, but a good many are comparatively modern. Some come from Western Asia, and some from India. We are sorry at present only to be able to mention thus generally the character of the work, but we hope to have an opportunity of returning to it, and of going further into detail.

---

*Biblical Papers; being remains of the Rev. W. H. Coleman, A.M.* London: Williams and Norgate. 1864.

IN noticing this slight memorial of one who would have performed still better things had he been spared, we have necessarily not much to say. The author was a painstaking and diligent student, and we are informed that he projected turning to a useful account the learned labours in which he engaged. His work here was, however, little more than preparatory, and he only left behind him, in a perfect form, enough to shew the character and extent of his researches, and to remind us that in his removal the Church lost one whose qualifications fitted him for important services. He occasionally contributed to this Journal; and the second of the articles in the volume under notice—that on Isaiah xviii., was one of his contributions to our pages. The editor of his remains truly says that they have "in their independence of thought and sound execution, a strong claim on the attention of the Biblical scholar and critic." The subjects are:—The Song of Deborah (Isaiah

xviii.); The Ode of Habakkuk (Psalm xxxi. 3); and river terms in the Old Testament. The last of the essays is incomplete;—a circumstance to be regretted on several accounts. Those who knew the author will be glad to possess this memento and sign of his attainments; and others will gather from it useful suggestions, not only as to the topics here treated of, but as to the manner in which such topics may be profitably handled.

---

*On the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures: shewing the Testimony which they themselves bear as to their own inspiration.* By JAMES STARK, M.D., F.R.S.E. London: Williams and Norgate.

DR. STARK claims and exercises his right as a layman to examine for himself the religious questions of the day. He has examined the Bible as to its inspiration, and finds that large portions have no pretensions to inspiration: "The Scriptures are not inspired in their every word," but "only those parts were given by inspiration which are revelations from heaven of things which men never could have known but through a divine revelation;" "in fact, the only parts of the Scriptures which are inspired are those to which we can with propriety apply the epithet 'the Word of God.' But more than this; it is proved to demonstration, that even of those parts of the Scripture which were truly given by inspiration, the inspiration resides not in the words, but in the things taught." Plain as the writer's conclusions are, and clear as are his chief reasons for them, there is a want of transparency both in his style and his thought. It is not our intention to point out wherein we differ from him specifically, because we believe his whole system fundamentally wrong. The book has a right to attention at the present time; but most assuredly if it falls into the hands of an orthodox critic, who has learning as well as acuteness, it will not be favourably reviewed.

---

*Arnold Prize Essay, 1863. The Holy Roman Empire.* By JAMES BRYCE, B.A. London: Macmillan and Co. 1864.

WE have in this volume, in a compact and summary form, one of the great histories of the world. The Roman empire, from its inauguration, and for some centuries onward, is in its general features pretty well known by most persons of education. But how it divided, and sunk and rose, and extended and contracted, and changed and migrated in subsequent ages, is only known to the student. Probably there are very few who could chalk out extemporaneously the main lines of descent from the sixth century to the close of the eighteenth. And yet in one form or another, and in one place or another, it extended its duration till the year 1806, when Francis II. resigned the imperial crown. Mr. Bryce runs rapidly down the stream of the old Roman empire, and past its revival by Charles the Great, to Otto the founder of the holy Roman empire in 962. He then proceeds to the Franconian and Saxon emperors, sketches the decay of the empire after Frederick II., touches upon the Reformation and its consequences, and draws up in

the presence of Napoleon the Emperor of the west. A larger book would have been easier, **but** we are exceedingly indebted to the author for the very student-like and instructive volume which he has produced, and which we have much pleasure in recommending.

---

*The Witness of the Eucharist, or the Institution and early celebration of the Lord's Supper considered as an evidence of the historical truth of the Gospel narrative, and of the Christian doctrine of the Atonement.* Being the Norrisian prize essay for the year 1863. By the Rev. G. F. MACLEAR, M.A. London: Macmillan and Co.

THIS book is on an admirable subject. It is well known what use is made by some of the old English defenders of Christianity, as Leslie, of the argument from commemorative institutions; nor are we aware of any one who has seriously applied himself to overturn that argument. In the present case, the celebration of the Eucharist is a witness both to a doctrine and to a fact. From the central position it occupies, it tells powerfully in favour of other doctrines and of other facts. Mr. Maclear very well understands the importance of this institution, and we fancy that those who read his book will smile or be disgusted at the impudent ignorance or falsehood of those who deny that our Lord either taught any religious doctrine or instituted any religious observance. The author of this useful essay goes into a variety of questions affecting the interpretation and intention of the Eucharist, and incidentally—perhaps unconsciously—refutes some of the shallow critical assertions of our generation. In a few details we should scarcely agree with the author, but *ubi plura nitent in carmine*, etc. The book has afforded us a treat, and we hope it may find many candid readers. Its style and spirit equally deserve commendation.

---

*Harmonic Maxims of Science and Religion.* By the Rev. W. BAKER, M.A. London: Longmans.

THE object of this work is twofold: to shew that certain maxims must be observed by those who would get accurate knowledge of nature and of revelation; and to shew, that while these maxims are observed by the students of nature, they are neglected by the students of revelation. The author says the maxims, axioms or postulates, are harmonic because "they contain the conditions of harmony between science and religion; and the conditions, therefore, of moral harmony." There have been many attempts to convey or to confirm religious truth by means of philosophy or on philosophic principles. We have before us a book the author of which tells us he had literally carried out the principles of Descartes in his famous "Method," and had thereby arrived at his religious opinions, such as they are. Mr. Baker believes that the "inductive method" of Bacon and his followers may be imitated in religious science. We think so too; and we think that any other method which can help a man to reach and to recognize truth divine would also be found profitable. We are quite sure that the

ingenious and skilful book of Mr. Baker will be welcome to the sincere and unprejudiced student. It contains many excellent thoughts, and is written in that manly spirit of independence which enables a man to defend the truth and to reject the error of his friends, and which carries out the principle of the old saw, "Plato is dear to me; Socrates is dear to me; but TRUTH is dearer than all." Mr. Baker's volume is remarkably free from rash and unadvised assertions, and from offensive epithets.

---

*The Dean's English: a criticism on the Dean of Canterbury's essays on the Queen's English.* By G. WASHINGTON MOON. Third edition. London: Hatchard and Co.

THERE is a French maxim which says, that the critic's torch should give light and not burn anything or anybody. This rule is often violated; critics burn their own fingers, burn the books they criticize, burn the authors of the said books, and burn a good deal beside. The critic's calling is exceedingly difficult, and requires for its successful prosecution an aggregate of moral and intellectual excellencies which few men possess, and which fewer still suppose to be necessary. The consequences are deplorable; because on the one hand men rush into criticism who are not fitted for the work, and because those who are fitted for it so often forget themselves. Again; it is a very difficult thing to speak and to write good English; yet everybody thinks he can both speak and write it, and most men fancy they can criticize it too. The difficulty of producing unexceptionable English, lays almost all writers and speakers open to censure. Dean Alford is an example: we know him to be a popular writer, and we believe him to be a good one; but he is not faultless, and, having been tempted in an evil hour to turn critic, he has brought upon himself a deluge of criticism. Mr. Moon in particular overwhelms him with accusations, to some of which we fear he must plead guilty. We read the book of Dean Alford on the Queen's English with considerable pleasure, and gathered out of it some useful hints; but we felt at the same time that he employed constructions which were doubtful, and that his opinions did not always agree with what we had been led to regard as good usage. Mr. Moon has raised a far larger number of objections than occurred to us, and the volume in which he embodies them is one of the smartest pieces of criticism we ever read. It is not only admirable as a specimen of critical style, but it abounds in suggestions which no man in his senses can undervalue: more than this, it is a delightful example of good writing. We do not say it is faultless; on the contrary, we could query a considerable number of expressions, beginning with the title, "a criticism on the Dean of Canterbury's essays on the Queen's English:" why not say "a criticism of the Dean," etc.? At the end of the first letter, Mr. Moon observes in reply to Dean Alford, that the word *its* occurs in our translation of the Bible at Lev. xxv. 5; but he should have said at the time that, in all the editions which preceded the protectorship of Cromwell the reading is, "*it owne accord*;" therefore

*its* does not occur in the version as originally made, as indeed is afterwards admitted. With respect to the aspiration of *h*, so far as we can ascertain, the old writers always prefixed to it the article *an*, and never *a*; therefore we cannot find in their usage a rule for our own. Our space forbids us to review the work at length, but we may say that, with some exceptions of detail, it is one that we may all read with advantage. The vigour of the critic is sometimes almost like severity, but we doubt if it is ever malicious, and so we enjoy the book and learn from it at one and the same time.

---

*Lyra Mystica: hymns and verses on sacred subjects, ancient and modern.*

Edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans.

THE editor of this elegant volume has previously published two others, —the *Lyra Messianica*, and the *Lyra Eucharistica*,—with which it is uniform. Many of these sacred poems are exceedingly beautiful as compositions, and most of them only express sentiments with which we agree. We confess, however, that we have our doubts as to the correctness of some theological or ecclesiastical conventionalisms, such as that of *devils laughing*: thus,—

“ *Devils’ laughter rang around me,  
Moaned doubt’s hollow sea—  
Where’s thy God? I know not any—  
Woe for me, for me !* ”

The figure in the second of these lines is very beautiful. The pieces are some of them from ancient and some from modern sources, in regard to which full information is supplied in the tables of contents. Altogether it is a charming volume, alike to the eye and to the mind: it charms the eye by its quaint yet beautiful letterpress, and by the excellence of its paper and general style; and it charms the mind by the full and harmonious flow and cadence of holy thoughts and words. Those who possess the former volumes will be equally pleased with this, and we are happy to be able to recommend it to notice.

---

*Three Months’ Residence at Nablus, and an Account of the Modern Samaritans.* By Rev. JOHN MILLS. London: John Murray.

THIS book reached us rather too late for detailed review in the present number, but we shall endeavour to give our readers as clear an idea of it as we can. But first of all, let us say that we are very glad Mr. Mills has been led to give the world this interesting record of his observations among and upon probably the smallest nation in the world, as well as the oldest and smallest sect. The work commences with topographical indications and scriptural reminiscencies, which are followed by special notices of Shechem or Nablus, and of its inhabitants, of whose domestic and social life, habits, manners, and character, we have full and explicit details. The topics we have enumerated constitute the first part of the book; the second and larger part, headed “The Modern Samaritans,” is more minute and technical. When we



say technical, we do not mean that it is a dry scholastic dissertation, but that it has to do with matters that frequently involve technicalities. Under the head of "Domestic Life and Duties" we have, for example, an account of various rites, ceremonies, and observances, which pertain to individual and household life. The three following chapters treat of the doctrines, the synagogue and services, and other religious matters pertaining to the community. The next two chapters go into the details of the Samaritan year and the principal festivals of the calendar. These are succeeded by accounts of Gerizim and holy places; by notices of the social condition, language, Pentateuch, and literature of the Samaritans. The antagonism of Samaritans and Jews is also described, and the volume closes with a short chronology furnished by one of the people.

From this glance at the contents of the volume, it will appear that its plan is comprehensive, and that every matter of importance has been attended to. The author's previous study of the opinions and practices of the British Jews has manifestly facilitated his work, and enabled him to distinguish clearly between such things as are peculiar to the Samaritans, and those in which they agree with the Jews. He has long cherished feelings of interest and sympathy in regard to the Samaritans, and this has stimulated him in his endeavours to gather respecting them the fullest and best information in his power. He has visited them twice, and on the second occasion resided among them for three months, during which time he won their confidence, respect, and affection, and by finding his way to their hearts was enabled to ascertain facts of considerable importance and value, and such as no casual visit would have rendered possible. He has, moreover, investigated the principal works which have been written upon the subject. And thus, in various ways, he has been enabled to produce a volume of peculiar originality and value. We know of no account of the Samaritans which is so full and explicit, and which can be set forth as so reliable and authentic.

We are all aware that the Samaritans have maintained a separate existence for far more than two thousand years: that although the Holy Land has passed through so many vicissitudes, and been ruled by so many masters, the Samaritans have contrived to subsist, and to retain their distinctive character, rites, customs, and opinions; that, in fact, even now, they, and they only, offer the Paschal sacrifice ordained by Moses. They are now but few, very few in number, and are becoming fewer, and their extinction seems to be only a question of time. Mr. Mills gives the number of Samaritans at Nablus as 151, and M. de Pressensé, who visited them in April, 1864, tells us there are but 135. This very circumstance, that they are passing away, naturally adds to the value and interest of the volume before us, and makes us thankful that it has been compiled while yet their organization continues.

There is so much in the book to which we should like to call attention that we scarcely know what to select. We may mention a few

points. The descriptions of Mounts Ebal and Gerizim are more exact than any heretofore published, for, strange to say, they have scarcely ever been minutely explored by Europeans; this is especially true of Ebal, which Mr. Mills carefully investigated, and the results are both curious and interesting. In his notice of Gerizim also, we note that he attempted to solve the mystery of the so-called "ten stones," which some have thought to be naturally, and others artificially fixed, but which he ascertained to be artificially laid, and to be separate blocks, and not parts of one rocky platform. Mr. Mills regards Mount Gerizim as the Moriah of Abraham, according to the Samaritan belief; he also believes that the Salem of Melchizedek was not far away, and therefore not at Jerusalem. For his reasons for these opinions, we must refer to the book. Jacob's well and the tomb of Joseph are alike accepted as authentic. Nablus is exhibited to us in its actual condition, but while we have been pleased with the distant survey, we have felt that it cannot be always comfortable as a residence. The streets, with one exception, are mostly narrow, irregular, and dirty, and the people are nine-tenths of them ignorant and bigoted Mohammedans. The five hundred to six hundred Christians are not all "the salt of the earth," and the two hundred and fifty Jews and Samaritans (one hundred of them Jews) have their faults. The Pentateuch is the Samaritan Bible, and of this they have copies of considerable value; one of them is a roll of extreme antiquity, and this, although guarded with jealous care, and considered too sacred for profane hands and eyes, Mr. Mills succeeded in examining. He was not able to complete his examination, but we are glad he was allowed to tell us so much. What he says on this subject is worthy to be read, and is both amusing and instructive.

Without going further into details, we may observe that our author has given his work as far as possible a narrative form, and this has enabled him to lighten and relieve some things which would otherwise have been less attractive to the general reader. We have much pleasure in recommending a book which bears all the marks of fidelity, accuracy, and thoroughness, and which exhibits to us a graphic and lifelike picture of the Samaritans and of their ancient rendezvous at Nablus.

---

*Meditations on the Essence of Christianity, and on the Religious Questions of the Day.* By M. GUIZOT. Translated from the French, under the superintendence of the Author. London: John Murray.

THE reader will find at p. 240 of this volume of the Journal, an announcement of the French edition of M. Guizot's work, and a list of the chapters it contains. There are several reasons why we are glad to welcome it in an English dress, and appealing to a larger circle. The author has a profound acquaintance with the facts and problems of history, and he has reflected deeply upon them. He has occupied a prominent place in our generation, and has been personally interested

in many very important movements. His studies, his social position, and his long experience, give him a claim to consideration which few can ignore. M. Guizot is a Christian: he believes in a living, conscious, and personal God; he accepts with implicit faith the supernatural in providence and grace, and even in miracles and prophecy: nay, he goes so far as to plead for the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Let no one, confident in the certainty of modern negations, imagine that M. Guizot has no reasons for his faith, and that he has put on the superannuated garments of an effete orthodoxy with the idea that they are new and befitting, only because his mother told him so. Neither, on the other hand, let the advocate of the extreme views of the evangelical party suppose that M. Guizot goes so far as they go, in every direction. Both will be disappointed: our author chooses his own ground; he defends every inch which he believes to be tenable, and he protects certain border districts with such forces as he thinks suitable. The cardinal doctrines of religion he guards with jealous assiduity, but when he speaks of *degrees* of inspiration the case is different. He admits into his creed both revelation and inspiration; but when it comes to this,—that he must either accept or reject plenary verbal inspiration, he tells us candidly that he cannot accept plenary verbal inspiration. He is concerned only to shew that inspiration is real and divine, and that it guarantees perfect accuracy in the religious teachings of the Bible. “It was not God’s purpose to give instruction to men in grammar, and if not in grammar, neither was it any more God’s purpose to give instruction in geology, astronomy, geography, or chronology. It is on their relations with their Creator, upon duties of men towards Him and towards each other, upon the rule of faith and of conduct in life, that God has lighted them by light from heaven. It is to the subject of religion and morals, and to these alone, that the inspiration of the Scriptures is directed” (p. 146). Singularly enough, the passage which M. Guizot quotes to illustrate his views of the nature and limits of inspiration is “the admirable parable” of the rich man and Lazarus, which has been lately discussed in our pages. Fearing nothing from scientific doubts, he concludes the chapter on inspiration in these words:—“I discard, then, as absolutely foreign to the grand question that occupies me, all the difficulties suggested to the Scriptures in the name of those sciences whose province is finite nature. I seek and consider in these books only what is their sole object,—the relations of God with man, and the solutions of those problems which these relations cause to weigh upon the human soul. The deeper we go in the study of the sacred volumes, restored to their real object, the more the divine inspiration becomes manifest and striking. God and man are there ever both present, both actors in the same history. Of this history it is my present object to illustrate the grand features.”

M. Guizot aims to occupy a strictly catholic position. There is no doubt of his own protestantism, but considering the common faith of Christendom to be now assailed, it is the common faith which he maintains. He recognizes discussion as a fact, and liberty as a right;

but inasmuch as he sees them perverted, and made subservient to attacks upon the foundations of religion, he thinks it a duty to come forward and defend religion. He is now done with public life, and he consecrates the leisure of retirement and the autumn of his days to the advocacy of those principles which he believes and loves. Four volumes are projected. The first, now before us, explains and establishes what constitutes, in his opinion, the essence of the Christian religion; "that is to say, what those natural problems are that correspond with the fundamental dogmas that offer their solution, the supernatural facts upon which these same dogmas repose,—creation, revelation, inspiration of the Scriptures, God according to the Biblical account, and Jesus according to the Gospel narrative." The second volume is to be occupied with the history of the Christian religion, including the authenticity of Scripture, the primary causes of the foundation of Christianity, Christian faith, the religious crisis of the sixteenth century, and other crises which have arisen, but which have been successfully passed. The third volume is to treat of the actual state of the Christian religion, both internally and externally; it will retrace the regeneration which occurred early in this century, the movements of spiritualistic philosophy, and those of materialism, pantheism, scepticism, and historical criticism. The fourth volume will deal with the Church of the future, its duties and its destiny.

For accomplishing the great work which he has projected, M. Guizot has many qualifications; and possibly his comprehensive survey will be all the more free and successful, that he writes without claiming to be more than he is—a layman of great experience, a gentleman of studious habits and varied acquirements, and a Christian who can give a reason for what he believes, and does not willingly believe against reason. In the present volume, we have a note upon grammatical anomalies in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. The examples from the Old Testament are supplied by M. Munk, and those from the New Testament are by the author's son.

Altogether this is a most interesting and useful book. It is remarkably lucid and even attractive in its style. The author writes deliberately, but earnestly, and wastes no space upon sentimental and rhetorical rhapsodies. We trust he may be spared to serve the Church by completing the admirable programme indicated above.

---

*The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.* Parts I. and II. People's Edition. By the Right Rev. JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D., Bishop of Natal. London: Longmans.

IN this popular edition of his recent work, Dr. Colenso both adds and abridges, as well as simplifies. Part I. now appears in fourteen chapters instead of twenty-three, and Part II. contains eighteen chapters instead of twenty-two. Some of the expressions which were most objectionable have been a little softened; but the changes introduced do not appear to have modified or weakened the author's convictions,

and he puts in the forefront of his advertisement this sentence: "In this edition of my work on the Pentateuch, I have desired to place in a clear and intelligible form, before the eyes of the general reader, the main arguments which have been advanced in my first four parts, as proving the *unhistorical character*, the *later origin*, and the *compound authorship* of the five books usually attributed to Moses." We recommend those who have the original work to procure this edition, as they may derive from it some fresh information respecting Bishop Colenso's actual opinions.

---

*The Word of Promise: a Handbook to the Promises of Scripture.* By HORATIUS BONAR, D.D. London: The Religious Tract Society.

THIS volume will be prized by earnest and spiritually-minded persons. It consists of two parts, the first of which is introductory, and the second a classified arrangement of Scripture promises with short prefaces to the respective sections. The promises are selected and printed at length from the Authorized Version, and will be found suitable for a great variety of characters and circumstances. For quiet moments, for aid in studying the Holy Scripture, and as a present to one's friends, we may safely recommend Dr. Bonar's carefully prepared work. Its external appearance and typographical execution are very attractive. The general heads are—Promises for the Sinner, The Saint, The Church, Israel, The World, and Special Cases and Persons.

---

*Home in Humble Life.* London: The Religious Tract Society.

A DOMESTIC story, well and truthfully written, and adapted for popular distribution, for prizes, presents, and school and congregational libraries.

---

*The Children's Prize.* Edited by J. ERSKINE CLARKE, M.A. London: William Macintosh.

A PRETTILY illustrated and instructive serial for children. It is remarkably cheap, and well edited.

---

*The complete Works of Stephen Charnock, B.D.* With Introduction by the Rev. JAMES M'COSH, LL.D. Vol. II. Discourse on the Existence and Attributes of God. Edinburgh: James Nichol.

WE noticed in our last number the first volume of this cheap and correct reprint of Charnock. The discourses in the second volume are upon God's wisdom, power, holiness, goodness, dominion, and patience. Though we cannot regard these discourses as models for modern sermons, we recommend them to modern preachers as a storehouse of sanctified thought and theological truth, and as not without passages both powerful and beautiful.

---

*Le Pays de l'Evangile: Notes d'un Voyage en Orient.* By E. DE PRESSENSE. With a map. Paris: Meyrueis.

WE suppose that M. de Pressensé was prompted to go to Palestine by the perusal of M. Renan's *Life of Jesus*; and, if it was so, our thanks are due to that attractive writer. Our author in an introduction gives some account of pilgrimages and travels in the Holy Land, and of the principal divisions of the country. The rest of his book is a journal, commencing with Alexandria, and taking in some portions of Lower Egypt. From Egypt the author proceeded, viâ Alexandria, by sea to Jaffa, and thence to Jerusalem. He visited Bethlehem, Hebron, and the Dead Sea; went north into Samaria, visited Sichem, Carmel, Nazareth, the Sea of Tiberias, and Banias. He subsequently went to Damascus and Baalbek, then embarked at Beyruth for Smyrna, and saw Ephesus, Constantinople, Athens, and Venice. The account is vivid and graphic, and the charm of the book is heightened by the warmth of the writer's affections. There is no mistake about the Christian faith and love of M. de Pressensé, and we shall now be all the more anxious to receive from him that sketch of the life of Jesus which he is preparing, and in view of which the journey we have commemorated was undertaken. This is a very interesting little work.

---

*The Earlier Years of our Lord's Life on Earth.* By the Rev. WILLIAM HANNA, D.D., LL.D. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

THE title hardly does justice to the book which is upon the earlier years of the life and ministry of the Redeemer. The sketches are in many respects bold and free, but always graceful, and reverential, and the author depicts the Saviour as one whom he loves, honours and trusts. Many incidents and facts are embodied in the composition, and the arrangement and telling of the whole remind us of the "apples of gold in pictures of silver" which we read of in holy Writ. The two former volumes upon our Lord's later days and passion have become deservedly popular, because they address the Christian heart and consciousness. We need only say of this, that it ought to have its place beside them.

---

*Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte.* Twelve Lectures. With a supplement on recent investigations concerning the Life of Jesus. By Dr. A. GEIGER. Breslau: Schletter.

THE author is a learned Rabbín of Frankfort-on-the-Maine, and it is scarcely to be expected that we should agree with all his views and conclusions. His lectures are not designed as an outline of Jewish history, but are a running commentary upon that history, including some of the institutions and doctrines of Judaism. Some of the lectures are curious and interesting, and we may commend to the notice of the Christian reader those portions of lectures ix.—xi., which are devoted to the origin, development, and prevalence of Christianity. We would

also call attention to the supplementary remarks, especially those upon Strauss and Renan.

---

*Household Prayer, from ancient and authorized sources, with morning and evening readings from the Gospels and epistles for each day of the month.* By the Rev. P. G. MEDD, M.A. With the sanction of the Lord Bishop of Oxford. London: Rivingtons.

IT will be sufficient for us in recording the appearance of this devotional manual for domestic use, to call attention to the words at the back of the title: "Sanctioned by me for use in the diocese of Oxford. S. Oxon."

---

*Geschichte des Rationalismus.* Part I. History of Pietism, etc. By Dr. A. THOLUCK. Berlin: Wiegandt and Grieben.

DR. THOLUCK is well qualified to undertake a work like the present. It is from an orthodox stand-point, and supplies us with information which will be found both valuable and instructive.

---

*Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie der Patristischen Zeit.* By Dr. F. UEBERWEG. Berlin: Mittler and Son.

THIS sketch of the history of patristic philosophy, follows one upon the history of philosophy before the Christian era, and is to be succeeded by a similar account for more recent times. It contains a good measure of useful matter, and reaches to about A.D. 700, or the age of Johannes Damascenus.

---

*Des Patriarchen Gennadios von Konstantinopel Confession.* Critically examined, etc. By Dr. J. C. T. OTTO. With an excursus on the date of Arethas. Vienna: Braumüller.

GENNADIUS lived in the middle of the fifteenth century. His confession is fitted to elucidate the theological views of the Greek church at the time he flourished.

---

*Real Encyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche.* Dr. HERZOG. Vol. XIX., Part I. Supplemental Portion. Gotha: Besser.

IT has been found necessary to wind up this important work with a supplement, the first half-volume of which is now before us, ending with the article Daub (Karl).

---

*De Natura et Notione Symbolica Cheruborum.* E. C. A. RIEHM. Basil and Ludwigsburg: Balmer and Riehm.

AN essay on Cherubic forms and symbols in which the author maintains that the cherubim of paradise, of the tabernacle, and of the temple were anthropomorphic; and that those of Ezekiel were exceptional forms. He makes out a very good case for his opinions.

---

*Bardesanes, der Letzte Gnostiker.* Von A. HILGENFELD. Leipsic: Weigel.

THIS is a learned enquiry respecting the life and writings of Bardesanes, his doctrine, and the relation in which the recently discovered dialogue on fate stands to the Clementine Recognitions.

---

*Man: his true nature and Ministry.* Translated from the French of Louis Claude de Saint-Martin ("Le Philosophe Inconnu"). By EDWARD BURTON PENNY. London: William Allan and Co.

THIS is a curious volume. It is constructed on the basis of an all-pervading mysticism; mysticism in nature, mysticism in philosophy, and mysticism in religion. Like all classes of mystics, the author has expressed many true and noble thoughts, and uttered many admirable sentiments; but, at the same time, we do not at all agree with this method of dealing with things: we must also say that we cannot accept all the doctrines taught in this work.

---

*Faith and Life: Readings for the greater Holydays and the Sundays from Advent to Trinity.* Compiled from ancient writers, with notes on "Eternal Judgment," and "Christ's Sacrifice." By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THE character of this work may be readily inferred from its title-page. The pieces appear to be judiciously selected, and are rendered into correct English. The book is every way fitted for promoting Christian edification, and will be found suitable for presentation. Many useful little notes are added. We hope the editor may extend his plan, so as to take in the whole of the ecclesiastical year.

---

*Meditations and Prayers for persons in private.* By PLUMPTON WILSON, LL.B. Fourth Edition. London: Rivingtons.

WE are glad to see this convenient and excellent manual in its fourth edition. It is printed on fine paper, with red lines in all the margins, and therefore has an attractive appearance. The contents are worthy of the casket, and we may mention the volume as very suitable both as a gift-book and for personal use.

---

*Proposals for the Extension of the Ministry in the Church of England, by the revival of a Lower Order of Ministers, and by the addition of suffragan Bishops, made on several occasions.* By the Ven. W. H. HALE, M.A., Archdeacon of London. London: Rivingtons.

ARCHDEACON HALE is a very decided churchman, but he is keenly alive to the necessity for adapting the agencies of the Church to the exigencies of the times. We believe that this is the only principle which will enable the Christianity of England to overtake the multitudes it has lost, by permitting the machinery of the Church to remain



what it was while everything else was changing and advancing. Gas-light, railroads, steam ships, and telegraphs, are only the symbols of a wonderful change in the world. We look in vain for steam, gas, and telegraphic machinery in the Church. No doubt much has been done these last forty years, but anything effective must be in harmony with the age; it must not go back to serge and hair shirts, to rope girdles and bare feet, to the mimicry of monkery and to playing at monks by shaving the heads of boys of seventeen and calling them priors, and by puerilities of that sort. Men are wanted with intellect and mental furniture, with God's fear, faith, love, and zeal, and these, by whatever name we call them, may do good service. The Archdeacon of London would restore some of those inferior orders of the ministry who are better known in Church history than in modern practice, and he would also revive suffragan or titular bishops. There are many admirable suggestions in the papers here collected, and we fancy that whatever controversy may arise as to the names by which the new workmen are called, there will be little or none as to the need for active measures. At the same time our own preferences are not in favour of a resuscitation of obsolete and outlandish titles, and we believe there would be a still stronger objection to such titles as are connected with the national reminiscences of Popery. Archdeacon Hale's publication is well worthy of attention.

---

*Gleanings from Scripture.* By the Rev. FREDERICK WHITFIELD, A.B. London: S. W. Partridge.

MR. WHITFIELD is the author of several books which have met with extensive approval, and the one before us is equally fitted for edification. It is written in an excellent spirit, and in a clear and attractive style, very earnest and devout.

---

*English Common Sense versus Foreign Fallacies, in Questions of Religion.* By JOHN DU BOULAY. London: Rivingtons.

A BRIEF but spirited discussion of many topics of importance at the present time. Well worth reading.

---

*Our Eternal Homes.* By a BIBLE STUDENT. London: Frederick Pitman.

THERE are many curious and interesting speculations in this elegant little volume. With much that it contains we should readily agree, but there are opinions advanced in it which we should not assent to.

---

*Evangelischer Kalender. Jahrbuch für 1865. Mit Beiträgen.* Herausgegeben Von FERDINAND PIPER. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben. London: Williams and Norgate.

IN this popular and instructive annual, we find an almanac, an elaborate essay on Dante and his theology, a series of Christian biographies,

and other interesting matters by different writers. It is a very excellent thing of the kind. The essay on Dante is alone worth the shilling the cost of the book.

---

*Scripture and Science not at variance : with remarks on the historical character, plenary inspiration, and surpassing importance of the earlier chapters of Genesis.* By JOHN H. PRATT, M.A., Archdeacon of Calcutta. Fifth Edition. London : Hatchard and Co.

WE are very pleased to find this useful and ably written manual in its fifth edition. It is a book which should be in everybody's hands.

---

*Notes on Spirit and Soul ; also on the relation of Heart and Spirit, in 1 Cor. ii.* By S. HANSOM. London : Nisbet and Co.

THIS is a contribution to the right understanding of the words "spirit," "soul," and "heart," as found in 1 Thess. v. 23, and 1 Cor. ii. The author's observations are very well and forcibly put. What he says is well deserving of attention.

---

*Royal Society of Literature : Annual Report ; The President's Address ; List of Members.* 1864.

THE Bishop of St. David's is the President of this useful Society. His address is interesting on several accounts, especially for the indications it furnishes of recent matters of importance to the learned world. With reference to the Simonides debate, the bishop thinks it for ever settled adversely to Simonides ; and we think so too.

---

*On Dr. Newman's Rejection of Liguori's Doctrine of Equivocation.* By the Rev. F. MEYRICK, M.A. London : Rivingtons.

MR. MEYRICK is thoroughly acquainted with the questions he handles in this cleverly written pamphlet. Nothing but miserable quibbling can even seem to refute what he here advances.

---

*The Scribe instructed unto the Kingdom of Heaven.* An Ordination Sermon preached in the Cathedral of Cork. By Rev. JOHN QUARRY, A.M. Dublin : Hodges, Smith, and Co.

A CAPITAL sermon with some appropriate notes. We are glad Mr. Quarry has published it, and hope it may do good. The text is Matt. xiii. 52. The preacher touches upon a number of questions now very prominent, and handles them in a summary but effective manner.

---

*The Epistles of St. Paul for English Readers.* 1 Thessalonians. By C. J. VAUGHAN, D.D. London : Macmillan and Co.

DR. VAUGHAN is a good Greek scholar, but he has been a teacher of Greek, and he has been tempted to make a very literal verbal rendering of one of St. Paul's Epistles. There is much that is admirable in what he has now done, and so far we quite approve of it ; but the

literal verbal translation is a mistake if not a failure, because those who are in a position to appreciate it must know Greek already. We say they must know Greek, for the translator has allowed many peculiarities of Greek idiom and expression to pass into English. If he does this in what he intends to publish, he will greatly lessen the usefulness and acceptability of a most desirable project. We also think he has been too careful to limit his illustrative notes to such points as Scripture itself throws light upon.

---

*Ancient Biblical Chronograms ; or, a Discovery of the Chronological use of the Majuscular Letters occurring in the Text of the Hebrew Scriptures.* By WILLIAM HENRY BLACK, F.S.A., etc.

THIS is a paper read before the Chronological Institute, and its object is to shew that the large letters which occur in the Hebrew text have a meaning. By connecting those which are found in the several divisions of the Bible, the author arrives at the conclusion that they are chronological indications of some important dates in Old Testament history. Chronograms, as they are called, are common in comparatively modern times. They are ordinarily regarded as ingenious methods of perpetuating a date or a number. The word *Lateinos*, as it is written by Irenæus, is made a chronogram in one sense, because it is made the exponent of the number 666 in Rev. xiii. 18. We must be cautious, however, about placing too much reliance upon such calculations : for example, the words *Apocalupsis Divina Beati Johannis*, treated as a chronogram, make 666. Mr. Black's essay is very ingenious, curious, and worthy of attention.

---

Customs and Traditions of Palestine, illustrating the Manners of the Ancient Hebrews. By E. Pierotti. Translated by T. G. Bonney. Cambridge : Deighton, Bell, and Co. London : Bell and Dalby.

Christian Certainty. By S. Wainwright. London : Hatchard and Co.

Hymns from the German. A new and enlarged Edition. Translated by F. Eliz. Cox. London : Rivingtons.

Replies to the Third and Fourth Parts of the Right Reverend the Bishop of Natal's "Pentateuch and book of Joshua critically examined." By Franke Parker, M.A. London : Bell and Daldy.

*These and some other publications reached us too late to be reviewed in the present number. Several contributions also have to stand over in consequence of the extra space allotted to exceptional matter. The increase in the Correspondence of the Journal, renders it desirable that our friends should study brevity, and should forward as early as they can, such letters as are intended for speedy insertion.*

## MISCELLANIES.

*Christian and Jewish Inscriptions.*—We have looked with some interest into the evidence supplied by the inscriptions on the much-controverted question, regarding the number of Christians who embraced the profession of arms in the early days of Christianity. The strong denunciations of the military oaths by Tertullian, *De Idolatria*<sup>a</sup>, and the martyrdom of St. Maximilian for refusing to serve, on the ground that it was unlawful for him as a Christian, have been urged as a proof that there cannot possibly have been any considerable number of Christians in the Roman army during the first centuries of Christianity. The number of epitaphs of soldiers in M. Le Blant's own collection is very small, and the same is true of the collection of M. De Rossi. But M. Le Blant has taken the trouble to compare the total number of soldiers who appear in a collection of about ten thousand pagan inscriptions, with that of the soldiers who are registered in a collection of about four thousand seven hundred Christian inscriptions; and he has ascertained that, while in the pagan list the soldiers form 5·42 per cent., they are only 0·57 per cent. in the Christian.

It may well be doubted, however, whether this comparison is a fair one. Considering the lofty notions which were inculcated and entertained in the early Church as to the dignity of the Christian profession, which was held to excel and overshadow all earthly titles of honour, it is far from probable that Christian soldiers, as a general rule, would parade upon their epitaphs the titles of any other warfare than that of Christ. Many of the inscriptions, therefore, which bear no evidence of the military profession, may yet be epitaphs of soldiers. Moreover, it is certain that a very large proportion of the ordinary epitaphs of pagan soldiers regard *officers* of higher or lower degree. Now it is equally certain that the proportion of officers would be much lower among the Christians than among the pagans. We are inclined, therefore, on the whole, to believe that the comparison made by M. Le Blant can by no means be relied on, as a conclusive test of the actual proportion of Christians to pagans in the armies of the early empire, and that the question must still remain open for determination upon other and independent grounds.

These very inscriptions, indeed, present, although in a different matter, a curious example of the occasional inapplicability of such tests. It is well known that a very large proportion of the early Christian community was drawn from the class of slaves and freedmen; and as, among the pagan epitaphs, the names of slaves and freedmen are of very frequent occurrence, one might naturally expect to find them in a similar, or nearly similar, proportion in the Christian collections. Now, strange as it may seem, allusions to the servile condition are almost entirely unknown in Christian epigraphy. Marangoni, in thirty years' exploration, met but one single epitaph of a freedman.<sup>b</sup> M. Le Blant could only discover two

<sup>a</sup> Cap. xix., p. 117. (Ed. Rig.)<sup>b</sup> *Acta S. Victorini*, p. 136.

epitaphs of deceased slaves (p. 22), and some five or six other inscriptions in which the names of living slaves are mentioned. The obvious ground of this suppression was that which is often professed in the acts of the judicial examination of the martyrs; viz., that in Christ there is no distinction of bondsman or free,\* and that by the Gospel liberty of Christ, the social stamp of slavery was obliterated, once and for ever, upon earth.

By a somewhat analogous application of the scriptural principle that man's life on earth is but that of a pilgrim or sojourner, and that his true country is beyond the grave, the Christian inscriptions habitually ignore all mention of the birthplace or country of the deceased. Out of about five thousand Christian inscriptions in Seguier's *Index*, only forty-five make mention of the country; and it may be added that, as if in recognition of the evangelical counsel to leave home, and father, and mother, and brother, and to follow Christ, the same persistent suppression extends, in nearly the same degree, to all those details of descent, at least as a designation of the individual, which form so conspicuous a feature in the pagan inscriptions of the corresponding period.

But we have dwelt too long on these critical discussions, and it is time to turn to the inscriptions themselves, as illustrating the Christian spirit of the several ages which they represent. It is hardly necessary to say that, in the ancient epitaphs, as in the modern, the utmost diversity of style may be recognized. In a notice of the Roman catacombs, published in this journal some years ago, the reader will find some epitaphs most touching for the extreme simplicity of their language and sentiment; and this simplicity is certainly the prevailing characteristic of the earlier inscriptions. But, on the other hand, we occasionally meet most exaggerated examples of the opposite style; and even M. De Rossi's volume, not to speak of M. Le Blant's, may, in some of its specimens, challenge comparison with the most affected sentimentalities of Père la Chaise, or the pompous inanities of our own St. Paul's.

Such rhetorical compositions, however, are the exception, while simplicity, and perhaps even rudeness, is the rule. Some inscriptions, indeed, are in the latter respect almost a puzzle. It needs all M. De Rossi's ingenuity to interpret the following:—

HIC QUIESCIT ANCILLA DEI QVE DE  
SVA OMNIA POSSEDDIT DOMVM ISTA  
QVEM AMICE DEFLEN SOLACIVMQ REQVIRVNT  
PRO HVNC VNVM ORA SUBOLEM QVEM SUPERIS  
TITEM REQVISTI ETERNA REQVIEM FELICITA  
S CAUSA MANBIS IIIIX KHELENDAS OTOBRI  
CVRBITINVS ET ABVMDANTIVS HIC SIMVL QUIESCIT  
DD NN GRATIANO V ET TEODOSIO AAVGG

Disregarding the strange agglomeration of errors of case, of gender, of number, and of orthography, which are crowded into these few lines, M. De Rossi adopts the reading of Marini: "*Hic quiescēt ancilla Dei, quæ de suis omnibus possidet domum istam, quam amicæ deflent sola-*

\* "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii. 28).

ciumque requirunt. Pro hac una ora subole, quam superstitem reliquisti. Æterna in requie felicitatis causa manebis, xiv. Kalendis Octobris, Cucurbitinus et Abundantius hic simul quiescunt. DDNN. Gratiano V, et Theodosio Augustis (consulibus)" (p. 133).

"Here rests a handmaid of God, who out of all her riches now possesses but this one house, whom her friends bewail and seek in vain for consolation. Oh pray for this one remaining daughter whom thou hast left behind! Thou wilt remain in the eternal repose of happiness. On the fourteenth of the Calends of October Cucurbitinus and Abundantius rest here together. In the consulship of our Lords Gratian (V.) and Theodosius Emperors."

We cannot help thinking, however, that Marini's explanation of "*hunc unum* subolem," "this one *daughter*," is a mistake. It seems hardly possible to doubt that a *son* is meant, possibly either Cucurbitinus or Abundantius, whom we find named in the latter part of the epitaph. M. De Rossi conjectures, too, with considerable probability, that "*Ancilla Dei*" is a proper name of that fanciful class described in a former page, like "*Servus Dei*," or "*Quod vult Deus*."

Another rude inscription of about the same period, A.D. 380, is worth transcribing for the tenderness of the sentiment contained under its uncouth form:—

INFANTIAETAS VIRGINITATIS INTEGRITAS MORVM GRABTAS  
FIDEI ET REVERENTIAE DISCIPLIA IC SITA RVTINA IACET QVE VIXIT ANIS XXI  
DEPOSITA III NONIS AVG EVAGRIO ET EVGERIO CCSS.

"Infantia ætas, virginitatis integritas, morum gravitas, fidei et reverentiæ disciplina, hic sita Rufina jacet. Quæ vixit annis XXI. Deposita III Nonis Augusti Evagrio et Eucherio consulibus" (p. 137).

The beauty of sentiment which pervades many of these rude compositions comes out very strikingly, in contrasting them with the pagan inscriptions of the same class. This is very remarkable in the different views of death which the sepulchral inscriptions of pagans and Christians exhibit—the former, as is meet in them "that have not hope," all gloom and despair: INFELICISSIMI AMISSIONE EJUS; PERPETUIS TENEBRIS ET QUOTIDIANÆ MISERABILI ULULATIONI DAMNATI; the latter professing as their law, VIVENTEM DEO CREDITE, FLERE NEFAS, and regarding death as but the entrance to true life:—

"Mens nescia mortis  
Vivit, et aspectu fruitur bene conscia Christi."

Here is a Christian mother's view of the early death of her child:—

"MAGUS PUER INNOCENS; ESSE JAM INTER INNOCENTIS COEPISTI QUAM STAVILES TIBI HAEC VITA EST; QUAM TE LETUM EXCIPET MATER ECCLESIAE DE OC MUNDO REVERTENTEM COMPREMATUR PECTORUM GEMITUS STRUATUR FLETUS OCULORUM."

The same habit of mind, referring all things to what, in the Christian view, is of course the great end of man, is often observable in little turns of expression, which please no less by their simplicity than by the felicitousness of the ideas which they embody. There is a world of deep Christian thought in the simple words: HOSPITA CARO.<sup>d</sup> And in the

<sup>d</sup> Le Blant, p. 333.

same view of our life on earth, as being but a brief journey towards our true home in heaven, the form employed to express the good work of the almsgiver is, AD COELOS PRAEMISIT OPES. "He sent his wealth before him to heaven" (p. 316). The happiness of the just after death is described as "repose in the bosom of Abraham" (p. 95). And the sentiment is occasionally conveyed in a playful allusion to the profession, or to the name of the deceased:—as in a semi-barbarous epitaph in the same collection, on a charitable merchant (negociator) named Agapus, who is described, by a metaphor borrowed from his trade, as having been throughout life a STACIO MISERIS ET PORTUS EGINIS; an anchorage for "the afflicted" and a "harbour for the needy" (p. 41).

This contrast between the spirit and sentiment of the Christian inscriptions, and that exhibited in the similar monuments of pagan Rome, suggests a comparison still more interesting to the historical student, for which a recent discovery at Rome has furnished the opportunity long desired; namely, of the form of epitaph in use among the early Roman Christians, with that of the contemporary sepulchral inscriptions of the Jewish population of the same city. Among the many discoveries of Bosio during the long series of his explorations, as the readers of our notice of the Roman catacombs may recollect,\* was that of a Jewish catacomb outside of the ancient Porta Portuensis, which he regarded as the burying place of the Transtiberine Jews. But, in the superior attraction of the Christian remains, then in all the first freshness of their interest, the Jewish monuments were comparatively overlooked. Aringhi, in his edition of the *Roma Subterranea*, printed one or two of the epitaphs; but the exploration does not appear to have been vigorously pursued; after a time the cemetery was forgotten; and, strange as it may seem, all trace, even of its site, has been lost. Recent explorations, however, both at Rome and elsewhere in Italy, have led to better results. At Venosa, the ancient Venusium, a very interesting Jewish cemetery, with many Hebrew inscriptions, and with the well known seven-branched candlestick as well as other symbols, was discovered in 1853. In 1854, another cemetery of the same general character was discovered at Oria. The most important, however, for the purpose of comparison, is that which was discovered at Rome, in the beginning of 1862, in a vineyard known as the Vigna Randanini, situated on the ancient Via Appia, some distance outside of the Porta Capena. Of the catacomb itself it will be enough to say, that in all its general characteristics it resembles the Christian catacombs; consisting of long streets, or galleries, excavated in the sandstone, with the tombs cut into their perpendicular sides. Instead of the Christian symbols of the cross, or the monogram, the anchor, the fish, or the ship, the Jewish graves display the seven-branched candlestick, the volume of the law, and other Jewish emblems; but in most other respects it would be difficult to distinguish between the cemeteries of the two races.

The point of comparison with which we are concerned at present is the character of the funereal inscriptions which the two communities respectively employed.

---

\* *Ed. Rev.*, vol. cix., p. 101.

Of the names which appear in the inscriptions only seven are Hebrew; twelve are Greek, and twenty-four Latin; and yet the prevailing language of the epitaphs is Greek. There is not a single one in Hebrew,<sup>f</sup> and only twelve out of the entire collection are Latin. It is plain, indeed, from many circumstances, that whatever may be said of the Roman Jews as a body, the Jews who used this particular catacomb must rather have been of the Dispersion than of Judea Proper. Some of the inscriptions, indeed, expressly attest the fact. Thus:—

MANNACIVS  
SORORI CHRYSIDI  
DULCISIME  
PROSELYTI

"Mannacius to his sweetest sister Chrysis, a proselyte" (*Nuove Epigrafi*, p. 15).

Accordingly, the language and structure of the epitaphs are all but identical with those of the Christian epitaphs of Rome. We find in these the same confusion of Greek and Latin in the same epitaph; the same peculiarities in the orthography of both languages; the same use of Greek inflections for Latin words; the same solecisms of government and structure; the same representing of Latin words in Greek letters, and the same rendering of the sounds of the vowels and diphthongs of either language in accordance with the peculiar orthography of the other. Several of these characteristics are curiously combined in the following short epitaph:—

BENE	ΡΩΣΑ
ΑΝΡΩΝ	ΧΥΙΙ
ΕΚΟΤΜΑΡΙ	ΤΟΤΣ
ΜΗΞΙΣ	ΧΤ.ε

The central column being occupied by the symbol of the seven-branched candlestick, the epitaph read as follows:—*Βενερώσα ἀνρῶν χυίι, ἔκου μαρίτους μήσις χν.* "Venerosa, aged 17 years, had a husband (was married) fifteen months." It is unnecessary to point out the many solecisms crowded into these few words: *ἀνρῶν* for *annorum*, combines the introduction of Latin words into a Greek sentence with the equally strange anomaly of declining the Latin word with a Greek inflection. The singularly anomalous form *ἔκου* (for *εἶχε*) can only be explained as a blunder of the author of the epitaph; and *μαρίτους*, which is but the rendering in Greek letters of *maritus*, is quite as clearly the blunder of a foreigner for the accusative *maritum*.

Much more important is the comparison of the sentiment and doctrine of these Jewish epitaphs with those of the Christian catacombs. And first, it is surprising to find that, while several of the symbols which appear upon the tombs are plainly Jewish, yet there are others which had hitherto been popularly regarded as almost as certainly Christian. The palm-branch, long considered as the Christian symbol of martyrdom, is a

<sup>f</sup> In a few the word *שלום* "peace," is found in Hebrew characters; and in one the Hebrew *ש* is employed, in a Latinized Hebrew name, to supply the want of any equivalent Roman character to express the Hebrew sound of *ש*.

<sup>ε</sup> Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 32.



favourite emblem in the Jewish cemetery. A forceps-shaped instrument, which, upon the slabs in the catacombs, many archæologists held to represent, and which very probably when standing by itself does represent, one of the torturing-hooks used among the cruel appliances by which the fidelity of the martyrs was tried in the persecution, is here commonly found on the Jewish tombs, not singly, it is true, as in the Christian, but in connection with the candlestick and the lamp and vessel of oil, being intended, as it would seem, to represent the forceps or scissors with which the lamp was trimmed.

Still more startling, however, is the fact, which these inscriptions reveal, that those well-known adjurations for the "rest," or "life" of the dead, on which Roman Catholic controversionalists rely as evidence of the early Christian use of prayer for the dead, are quite as frequent an accompaniment of the Jewish epitaph as of the Christian; nay, that, if the inscriptions in M. De Rossi's great Christian collection, so far as it has yet proceeded, be compared with Father Garrucci's purely Jewish series, the proportion of such prayers in the latter will be found to exceed very considerably that which appears in the Christian collection. The fact is so novel, that we shall transcribe a few of the most characteristic specimens. The form occurs in the Latin as well as in the Greek epitaphs. Thus :—

"MARCIA BONA JUDEA. DORMI(TIO) TUA I(N) BONIS."

"Marcia a good Jewess. Thy sleep be amongst the good!"—p. 34.

And

"ALEXANDER  
BUBULARIUS DE MA  
CELLO QVIXIT ANNIS  
XXX. ANIMA BONA OM  
NIORUM AMICUS  
DORMITIO TUA INTER  
DICAËIS (*δικαίους*)."

"Alexander, a flesher from the shambles, who lived thirty years. O good Soul, friend of all men, may thy sleep be amongst the just!"—p. 44.

In the following, besides the actual prayer, there is an address to the reader to beg his prayers also :—

ΕΝΘΑΔΕ ΚΕΙΤΑΙ  
ΙΩΣΗΉΣ ΤΟ ΝΗΠΙΟΝ  
ΗΔΥΝ ΕΤ ΒΗΗ ΠΡΟ  
ΚΟΠΙΣ Ο ΠΑΤΗΡ ΚΡΙΣ  
ΠΙΝΑ ΔΕ ΜΗΤ ΠΡΟΣ  
ΕΥΧΟΙΟ ΕΝ ΕΙΡΗΝΗ  
ΤΗΝ ΚΤΜΗΞΙΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ.

"Here lies Josès, a sweet infant aged two years and eight months. His father was Procopius, and his mother Crespina. Pray for his sleep in peace!"<sup>a</sup>

The discovery of these forms on the Jewish epitaphs has been hailed in the schools of popular polemics with no little triumph, as a new evidence of the extra-evangelical origin of the analogous prayers for the

<sup>a</sup> *Nuove Epigrafi*, p. 8.

dead which are in use in the modern Roman Church. It is right to know, nevertheless, that the fact of these prayers having been in use among the Jews has long been well known to students of archæology. Bosio published in his *Roma Subterranea* a few specimens of the epitaphs of the Jewish catacombs discovered by him, in which the very same form occurs. And indeed, so far are the Roman archæologists from concealing the analogy between some of the usages and forms of their church and those of ancient Judaism and even Paganism, that, soon after the publication of Conyers Middleton's celebrated *Essay on the Heathen Origin of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Roman Church*, an elaborate work was published in Rome, and under the patronage of the cardinal vicar, by the celebrated Giovanni Marangoni, with the express purpose of avowing the analogy,<sup>4</sup> and even tracing it into details far more minute and curious than those suggested by the English controversialist. Nay, it would seem from the only English Roman Catholic notice<sup>5</sup> of the recent discovery which has come under our observation, that, far from shrinking from the publication of the facts, they on the contrary regard it as a confirmation of that argument in favour of their doctrine which they draw from the epitaphs of the Christian catacombs, and which we discussed on a former notice of that interesting subject.—*Edinburgh Review*, July, 1864.

*Early Christian Art.*—That the early Christians should retain the same gesture of prayer towards the only God which they had used towards idols is no slight refutation of their jealousy of all profane associations. The ancient attitude of prayer—the uplifted arms and open, upturned hands—was one instinctively adopted by a race whose gestures were full of meaning, symbolical and natural. This attitude pleaded for help by the very helplessness of the petitioner. In such a position the suppliant could not defend himself; therefore it was the posture most proper to prayer. It was thus Eneas, when in danger of perishing by the tempest, prayed to the gods—"Duplices tendens ad sidera palmas." It is in this attitude that Daniel stands between the lions, and that the Three Children stand in the furnace. This attitude is alluded to frequently in Scripture, "When ye stand praying" (Mark xi. 25); "I will therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy hands" (1 Tim. ii. 8). To those conversant with the art of the catacombs, a woman veiled and standing in this gesture of prayer is a familiar image. This image occurs frequently on walls and ceilings, and is also observable in the centre compartment of sculptured sarcophagi. The interpretation of the Roman Church to this day, as seen in Padre Marchi's work, identifies this frequently-repeated figure with the Virgin Mary. Protestant commentators, knowing the untenable nature of that solution, have offered another scarcely less absurd. The figure, according to them, is that of the Church. It does not seem to have occurred to either class of inter-

<sup>4</sup> *Cose Gentilesche e profane trasportate ad Uso ed Adornamento delle Chiese.* Per Giovanni Marangoni. 4to. Roma: 1744.

<sup>5</sup> *Dublin Review*, new series, vol. i., p. 377. The same view is taken in the *Théologie des Catacombes*, of the Abbé Bouix, published at Arras this year.

preters, that in thus exalting the meaning of this female figure, it would be difficult to account for the equally frequent presence of a male figure in the same attitude. We venture to assert that this figure—male or female—simply denotes the monumental idea of deceased persons of distinction, who were able to perpetuate their remembrance in a more marked way than by the usual simply-inscribed slabs which covered the commoner herd. These figures appear also chiefly on the walls and ceilings of those larger spaces in the catacomb corridors, called “Cubicula,” which are believed to have been appropriated to the interment of families of wealth and rank. They stood accordingly with uplifting arms, with the same intention as many an effigy in our days lies recumbent with folded palms. They, or their survivors, may be also supposed to have selected the sacred subjects which surround the suppliant, just as the Christians of many centuries later selected their favourite saints in a votive or monumental picture. Thus we see a man or woman, sometimes both, standing with uplifting hands, with Daniel between the lions, or the raising of Lazarus. or the story of Jonah—the subject being always typical of the resurrection—filling the space around them. And the evidence that such figures represent deceased persons in prayer is confirmed by an amplification of the same idea. This is seen both in the mural paintings, and on more than one of these richly-sculptured marble sarcophagi, where a woman, standing with uplifting arms, appears with a male figure in gestures of profound respect on each side, whose hands, one or both, support her elbow. This again was viewed by the Romans as confirming the identity of the Virgin Mary, thus worshipped by SS. Peter and Paul; and in turn by the Protestants as the Church similarly honoured; while at the same time, when seen in the narrower dimensions of the sarcophagi, where the two male figures are unavoidably placed closer to the woman, the idea of homage was transformed into something as much the reverse, and the group was pronounced to embody the story of Susannah and the elders! We may, now, however, venture to account for the two male figures in a simpler way. For we learn from one of the most enlightened writers on objects of classic-Christian antiquity,<sup>k</sup> that the “*delicatezza*” of the higher class of Christian matrons shunned even the slight inconvenience of this position of prayer, and that it was their custom to be accompanied by two attendants, who supported on each side the arms of the luxurious suppliant. Viewing the subject with this glossary, the intention of the male figures, and their subordinate condition will be found unmistakeable.

As regards the sacred person of the Virgin, she takes that place only in the art of the catacombs which the purity of earlier Christianity would lead us to predicate. She is seen there solely in a Scriptural and historical sense—in the subject of the Adoration of the Wise Men who found “the young Child and his mother.” And this even takes its place among the later productions of classic-Christian art; whilst the subject of the nativity, which occurs on two sarcophagi, evidently belongs to the last decline of that period. With these two exceptions, no trace of a

<sup>k</sup> Buonarroti, *Vetri Antichi*, p. 121.

representation of the Virgin can be found in the mural or sculptural art of the catacombs.

The same observations hold good with regard to St. Peter, of whose identity, however frequently seen through Roman Catholic eyes, it would be difficult to cite one certain example until a comparatively late time. That St. Peter and St. Paul together were constantly represented at one time on objects deposited in the catacombs, is proved by the ancient glass vessels, where their bust length effigies, known by the inscriptions round them, appear at the bottom. To these, which are most of them of the earliest type of art, it would be difficult to assign any precision of date; though, if the uplifted hand, with the two extended fingers, be interpreted as meaning the act of benediction, the glasses must be placed in a comparatively late part of the classic-Christian period. For this act—whether Greek or Latin—is also a date. In the person of our Lord it will be hardly found to commence, even in the Divine hand seen alone, before the latter part of the eighth century; in that of the apostles or other saints the date may be put considerably later. At all events, it is obvious that “Petrus” and “Paulus,” or “Saulus,” as he is often inscribed on these glass fragments, were, for long, placed on an equal footing of popularity in the Latin Church; and this is confirmed by the evidence of history. As for the individual person of St. Peter, where the inscription of his name is wanting, it would be impossible, in the absence of their attributes, to distinguish him from the other apostles. On certain sarcophagi, it is true, where our Lord stands with six apostles on each side, St. Peter is pronounced to be the figure on his left hand, receiving a long jewelled cross. It is very possible that this supposition may be correct; though it may be doubted whether the jewelled cross conveys any allusion to his form of martyrdom, for it is as often in these sarcophagi given by Christ to the apostle on his right. Moreover, the same cross is seen in the hand of St. Lawrence, identified by his name, in the catacomb of S. Ponziano. The only instance in which the identity of St. Peter is positive is in the catacomb dedicated to Pope Julius, where he stands on an equal footing with SS. Pollio and Marcellinus, each with his name inscribed; and here the absence of all distinguished honour to his person is striking, for he does not even occupy the centre place.

And now we are reminded of a sarcophagus on which the subject of Christ giving the keys to a figure, which can only be interpreted as St. Peter, is sculptured. This example is quoted by writers of the Roman communion as a proof of the very early assertion of the Papal supremacy. The sarcophagus in question presents rather peculiar conditions, being singularly sharp, fresh and uninjured; and obviously unfinished, for the marks of the chisel are seen rough upon the draperies and ground. It consists only of a front—back and sides being additions—and was found in the catacomb of the Vatican, the body still in it, and enveloped in cloths. Unlike almost every other classic-Christian sarcophagus, the feet of the figures have neither covering nor sandals. These are minutiae which may assist inquiry into this particular example of ecclesiastical archæology.

But the subject, as generally connected with St. Peter and the keys

is rather curious, and deserves a little close attention on our part. Like every other symbol and incident seen in art, the keys and the giving of the keys are dates which can be ascertained with tolerable certainty. Those on this sarcophagus will be found to bear witness rather to the long duration of the classic-Christian period than to the early commencement of this evidence of the Papal domination.

The first indication of a key or keys at all will be naturally sought for on coins belonging to the Roman See. By these we mean those rude and degenerate forms of money, not strictly, perhaps, to be called pontifical, for the name of the Emperor of the time is more often inscribed on them than that of the pope. Not until the Carolingian dynasty began to decline was there any chance of the appearance of St. Peter upon the Roman money. His very rude effigy, the consonants of his name being seen, placed irregularly round his head, is first perceived, holding a cross-surmounted staff and one key, on a coin inscribed on the reverse with the name of the Emperor Charles the Bald, who reigned from 875 to 877—therefore in the pontificate of John VIII.; and just after that of Nicolas I., the pope who first caused himself to be crowned. It does not seem, however, that much importance, as connected with the Papal idea, was attached to this symbol; for St. Peter appears on the same class of coin, under the same pope, with no key at all, nor does the key recur for a full century afterwards. But coins, we must remember, however important for historical facts, are not so significant of prevalent and established ideas as are works of art. Through these, therefore, the question of date must be considered; and here we find that the symbol of the key does not first shew itself in art in connection with the apostle. It is Christ, and not St. Peter, in whose hand it first appears. This is derived from passages in Revelation: "These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David; he that openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth" (iii. 7); and again, "I am he that liveth and was dead, and behold I am alive for evermore, Amen: and have the keys of death and hell." Accordingly, the representations from the Book of Revelation—and they are some of the earliest in what we may call independent art—shew Christ seated on the rainbow, with the key in one hand and sceptre in the other,<sup>1</sup> or with two keys in one hand and blessing St. John with the other.<sup>m</sup>

St. Peter, on the other hand, is not seen unmistakeably with this symbol till the twelfth century, when he appears with one key only.<sup>n</sup> Towards the end of the twelfth and at the beginning of the thirteenth he holds two keys. Yet here, as with the coins, it is long before the key becomes his established attribute. On the wooden doors of S. Maria in Capitolio at Cologne, St. Peter has no key: in the mosaics of S. Maria in Trastevere, at Rome, twelfth century, no key; on the "Châsse des Grandes Reliques" at Aix-la-Chapelle, thirteenth century, again no key; nor may the attribute be considered fairly introduced till the fourteenth.

<sup>1</sup> Early ivory, in possession of Mr. Essing, Cologne.

<sup>m</sup> *Bible de Noailles*. Bibliothèque Impériale, Paris.

<sup>n</sup> Cotton C., French MS., British Museum.

But we now come to the actual incident of the *giving* the key or keys to Peter, which may be regarded as the direct evidence of the assertion of the papal supremacy. This was bound to shew itself earlier in the field—the investiture before the possession. Accordingly, as far as rather extended researches have brought it to light, we are inclined to think that one of the first examples will be found in a magnificent MS., called the Bamberg Evangelium,<sup>o</sup> executed for Henry II. of Germany, surnamed the Pious, who reigned, first as king, and afterwards as emperor, from 1002 to 1024. Ciampini<sup>p</sup> shews two other instances of the same century—under Victor II., 1055-1057, and under Alexander II., 1061-1073. In all these cases but one key appears. By the twelfth century, however, Christ invests the Apostle with two keys.

Without any great stretch of the historian's licence, it is permissible to remark that the assertion of the dogma at the beginning of the eleventh century, through hands always guided by ecclesiastical machinery, is significant of the reign of that pious monarch, namely, Henry II. of Germany, for whose eyes the illustration was directly intended, and under whom the Church considerably increased in power; while the amplification and further definition of the meaning of the subject, implied by the two keys, in the twelfth century, points to that event in English history which brought another Henry II. in humble submission to the dictates of Rome.

At the same time, the fact of one key first given, and subsequently two, is partially accounted for in the writings of the time. The works of St. Ambrose (fourth century), much commented on the middle ages, include a sermon on the key given by Christ to St. Peter. This sermon, it is true, is known to be spurious; but, far from being less valuable as evidence on that account, it is obviously the more so. For such fabrications were expressly intended to suit the modes of thought prevailing at their own time; while in proportion to the lateness of the forgery does our theory of the true date of Peter's keys in art gain strength. With the truly evangelical illustration of the dying Stephen, who saw "the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God," this sermon explains that the key spoken of to Peter was that of faith, which can alone unlock the kingdom of heaven. Accordingly, with *naïve* literality it maintains that but one key was meant, because but one door was to be opened by it. More far-fetched arguments, born of scholastic theology, soon led to the more significant symbol of the two keys. These were declared to set forth the knowledge of doctrine and the power of jurisdiction—in other words, the spiritual and temporal power of Rome, against which Dante, in his memorable lines, was perhaps the earliest Protestant—

"The Church of Rome,  
Mixing two governments that ill assort,  
Hath missed her footing, fallen in the mire,  
And there herself and burden much defiled."<sup>r</sup>

Later, the analogies became more subservient still to the one main purpose which runs through history. One key was declared to be of gold,

<sup>o</sup> Now in the Royal Library at Munich.

<sup>p</sup> Ciampini, *Vetere Monumenta*, vol. i. tab. lxxvii.

<sup>r</sup> *Purgatory*, canto xvi.

the other of silver or iron, as seen in the hand of St. Peter in the picture of "Christ in Glory," by Fra Angelico, in our National Gallery—the one key meaning absolution, the other excommunication. It is this idea to which Milton—always imbued with Italian images, poetical and pictorial—makes allusion in his poem of "Lycidas"—

"Last came, and last did go,  
The Pilot of the Galilæan lake;  
Two massive keys he bore, of metals twain,  
(The golden opes, the iron shuts amain)."

Last of all, the symbols are found three in number, interpreted to the faithful as the keys of heaven, hell, and purgatory. And these may be pointed out in mosaics of such early time as, if genuine, to overthrow all the dates we have thus tediously inflicted on our readers. But, as with the modern human jaw discovered in the ancient chalk cliffs at Abbeville, so in art, wherever modern ideas are found in ancient forms, a tampering hand of some kind may be unhesitatingly suspected. And here we may be reminded by the readers of Gibbon of "the famous mosaic of the Lateran, A.D. 792 (by other authorities the date is 797), which represents Christ, who delivers the keys to Peter and the banner to Constantine" (vol. ix. p. 141, note). Whether Gibbon, or the authority he quotes—Muratori—were qualified judges in matters of Christian archæology may be questioned. But the more important fact is that in their day (equally in that of the Italian, as of the English historian), what with the opposite operations of time and restoration, very little indication had been left of this subject, and certainly none of its treatment. That a work, attempting in some fashion to symbolize the power assumed by the popes after the promulgation of the donation of Constantine, should have been executed under Pope Leo III. (795-816), is probable: but the mosaic in question is known to have been so ruined at the beginning of the seventeenth century that the principal figures—Christ, St. Peter, and Constantine—no longer existed. In the time of Urban VIII., 1623-1644, it was reconstructed partially from a drawing taken only seventy years before, and therefore scarcely more intelligible than the ancient mosaic itself. Again, this second edition was destroyed in the time of Pope Clement XII., 1730-1739, and it is another supposed copy now on the outside of the Santa Scala which Gibbon saw in 1764,—if he saw or cared about it at all. A work, therefore which has passed through such vicissitudes will hardly upset evidence gathered from uninjured sources. In the change even from the first to the second copy (the first having been engraved by Ciampini), three keys have been put into the lap of St. Peter, which were not there before!

Altogether it must be borne in mind by those who attempt to investigate history through forms of art, that mosaics are, of all sources, the least trustworthy. Restoration with them is, after the lapse of centuries, an indispensable operation. There are very few, in Rome especially,

---

\* Bunsen, *Beschreibung der Stadt Rom.*, vol. iii., part i., p. 552 et seq. The *History of Painting in Italy*, by J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle, p. 49, reports that two heads in the Vatican Museum are all that remain of the original mosaic.

which have not been thus vitally altered in those minutiae which convey history. For the mediæval mosaicist, like the mediæval architect, repaired and filled up according to the style of his own time. If the originally simply uplifted hand of the Saviour was obliterated, he inserted it in the act of benediction; if no nimbus or merely the circle had surrounded his head, he made it cruciform. Thus the chronology of art has been constantly, even without direct intention, interrupted in this form. Another instance as regards the symbol of the key may be observed in the originally Arian baptistery of S. Maria in Cosmedin at Ravenna, where its presence in the hand of St. Peter, instead of the ancient scroll borne by the eleven other Apostles, shews how late it was before the Church of Rome felt called upon to insert this badge of her supremacy. Perhaps, however, the greatest instance of modern zeal in the falsification of history belongs to Padre Marchi, who, in the frontispiece of his work—made up of a conglomerate of supposed subjects from the catacombs—boldly inserts the keys of Peter into the Labarum of Constantine!

To return, therefore, to the subject from which we started; namely, the sarcophagus on which appears the incident we have thus digressingly analyzed. We venture to pronounce that it cannot be ascribed to a period earlier at all events than the eleventh century; while the fact that two keys are being bestowed places it possibly in the twelfth. Thus, while art serves to shew what history is, she is equally trustworthy in proving what it is *not*.

And now, taking the certain fact that the Junius Bassus sarcophagus belongs to the fourth century, and the not improbable conclusion that the one bearing the subject of Christ giving the keys to Peter is, at all events, of the eleventh century, we arrive at some idea of the number of ages over which the art of the catacombs extends. As to intervening dates, these, doubtless, with close research, might be proximately defined; though in some measure art here defies even her own evidence. For ecclesiastical art is always in the main stationary. We see it thus to this day in Russia, where ecclesiastical and secular art may be seen to exist side by side,—the one a stagnant lake, the other a puny rill. There can be no doubt that the same state of things prevailed both in the Eastern and Western empire for many centuries. Thus the repetition of the same subject, and even treatment argues, in some instances, no identity of period. This is proved by comparing a subject from the catacombs with its prototype above ground. We take, for instance, Christ, as the Agnus Dei, in the centre, with six sheep on each side, as seen on more than one sarcophagus. What the first date of this allegorical conception may be, we know not; but we trace its first appearance above ground in the mosaics of SS. Cosimo and Damiano at Rome, A.D. 530, and its continuance through those of S. Apollinare in Classe at Ravenna, A.D. 671—677, those of S. Prassede at Rome, A.D. 827—those of S. Clemente at Rome, A.D. 1099-1118—to finally those of S. Maria in Trastevere, A.D. 1130-1143, thus shewing the same subject and treatment for a period of above six hundred years.

But, as a general rule, it may be assumed that those subjects of the catacombs which advance beyond ideas appropriate to a place of sepul-



ture are of the later class in time, and date probably from the first strivings of independent art above ground, which, in its turn, reacted on the classic-Christian traditions. For art did not wait until she had spent her classic impetus, which was more or less local in force, and ran on, as we have seen, possibly to the twelfth century. She found her turning-point in other localities long before then. Other conditions met her, and bent her to new, and, in some sense, higher purposes. Hitherto she had served a race who, however outwardly Christianized, still demanded from art the two favourite elements of ancient Greek contemplation—beauty and tranquillity. And if beauty were past her power to continue to create, she, at all events, adhered to its degenerate mask. Classic-Christian art is, therefore, to the last, as she was at the first, gay, cold, and comfortable to look on; suggesting neither mystery, awe, nor pathos. But meanwhile other seed had been sown, and was bearing fruit in solemn forms and strange meanings, which tell of the changes in kingdoms and the infusion of new races. It would seem that the very mysticism of a mythology engendered under ruder skies led the way more naturally to the conception of the infinite and the everlasting. For there is no doubt that these ideas in art were first enunciated by Northern races; “Christ is here no longer the fairest of the sons of men, endowed with the terrestrial persuasions of youth, grace, and beauty; but he is the enthroned God of the universe, riding upon the heavens, and as separate from us as they are from this earth.” Such conceptions are seen on ivory gospel covers as early as the ninth century,<sup>\*</sup> where a higher order of worshipping creatures proportionably exalt the idea of the being adored. Here new and awful forms come before us. For the six-winged seraphim stand around the enthroned Saviour, and sun, and moon, earth, and ocean, so help by their homage the sense of his supernatural majesty, that man’s fall and man’s sufferings seem matters too puny to intrude. But if an almost undue divorce between human wants and heavenly pomp over-power in some instances the mind, the balance is kept true in others. In one remarkable object, itself a date, and also known to be the work of a Northern artist—the altar of S. Ambrogio at Milan—the new and the old ideas are blended together. Christ enthroned in the centre is separate from us in his unapproachable glory, but the attributes of the four evangelists tell of his faithful relationship to this small world, while the old catacomb subjects of the miracles entirely restore him to us as the friend even of the least of the sons of men.

At and before this time also the painful view of Christ’s life on earth—so strictly avoided by classic Christian art—had emerged from this more earnest ground. Strange and fantastic creations now appear, for art had not only really returned to the conditions of a little child, but to those of one whose limbs were confined by every kind of swathing impediment. Nothing can be more singular than the early miniatures, possibly from Iona, preserved in the ancient convent library of St. Gall on the lake of Constance. The “*Evangeliarium Scotticum*,” of the eighth century, shews, perhaps, the earliest instance of that horror-invested fact—

---

<sup>\*</sup> *Evangelium, Ancient Library of St. Gall.*

the crucifixion. Rude beyond expression is this—the Christ with red arms and blue legs, and wrapt in purple drapery like as with the coils of a serpent. No traditions of any art can be discerned in these miniatures, which rise, as it were, from the ranks of the human mind, and have no merit but that of aiming at something above it. This art, however, gained the use of her limbs at no expense of her reverential solemnity. Terrible facts of mockings and scourgings now come before the eye, as told and illustrated in the *History of our Lord*, yet with the idea of Christ's majesty always paramount. If earnestness had taken the place of the conventions that went before, familiarity had not bred that contempt for religious propriety that was to follow after.

One phase of art which has a peculiar reference to history occurs in the eleventh century. The expectation of the millennium, and with it, in some sense, the destruction of the world, left its impress, as is well known, upon architecture, and also upon imitative art. Not till the idea had passed away that the world was coming to an end at the expiration of a thousand years, did art begin to expatiate on the fact that the world had been created. This chapter is one of the most original in the "history of our Lord." As decorations of the many churches which sprang up or were restored in the eleventh century, the subjects of the creation of the world and of man appear not unfrequently in the form of mosaics. The series in the vestibule cupolas of St. Mark's at Venice is seen first, in part, illustrated in this work. Here, where the art is by no means contemptible, there is an ingenuity of thought much beyond it. It was easy in the literal following of the Scripture text to represent the *naïve* idea of the seventh day under the form of an angel, and with Christ literally blessing it, as it bows before his throne. But the further idea of shewing the seventh day as wingless, and, in that sense, inactive, while the other days all stand by fully winged, and therefore fitted for work, is as ingenious an instance of the power of art over what we may call illusion as can be quoted from any time.

It would be strange if the course of art did not shew traces of the disputes and differences in the early church, and the feelings they engendered. And these signs appear as early as the fifth century like discords among scenes redolent with the dignity and surface-serenity of classic feeling. Though images of violence and suffering were banished, though there were no flagellations and no crucifixions, yet bitterness found its form, and persecution its expression. We allude to a mosaic in the chapel of Galla Placidia at Ravenna, where Christ, with the cross on his shoulder, and a fire burning at his side, is advancing to burn the Arian books, which are seen behind in a kind of cupboard with open doors. If the Arians, who built and decorated some of the earliest churches and baptisteries in Ravenna, retorted in the same style, no record has remained. Some evidence, at all events, of the forbearance of the mild Goth Theodoric, and of the Arian archbishops, may be gathered from the fact that they allowed this mosaic to stand unmolested in this, the chiefly Arian city of Ravenna. But unworthy as this mosaic is of the dignity of art, it is courteous and Christian as compared with the devices used in later times, when fanatics no longer confined themselves to burning books. In

various miniatures, where fierce feeling and rude art ran more congenially together, Arius is made the pendant to Judas, both enchained in flames; while, as art advanced to her palmier times, Mahomet was admitted as a third in those hideous scenes of hell sanctioned by the church, which polluted the peace of the cemetery in the Campo Santo at Pisa and elsewhere. And when the hatred against the infidel and the Turk had given place, not to pity, but to time, the Jew was substituted in these unholy dishonours, as may be seen in numerous instances in cinque-cento pictures, or in earlier and ruder engravings; while, later still, Isabella of Castille's worthy grandson—the Emperor Charles V.—is seen with perfect equanimity trampling under his horse's feet a prostrate Moor. This occurs in a picture in Mr. Baring's gallery by Bernard van Orley, the beauty and finish of which only further points the odious moral which is intended.

It would be strange, too, if another dogma, which has left many a scar on the surface of history, and has affected the peace of the world as much as the papal keys—we mean that of the Divine right of kings—had not found its place in the archives of art. In truth the two rise to sight, as might have been expected, from the laws of repulsion and the history of antagonism, pretty much at the same time. To our feelings it is the profanest sight that early art offers when the sacred person of Christ is summoned to bless some abject tyrant of the eastern empire, or barbaric despot of remoter position, who, instead of being bowed at his feet, as others are at theirs, stand with their trumpery worldly trappings upon them, and bend no knee before the King of kings. Thus we see the wretched Romanus Diogenes, and his wife the Empress Eudocia (married 1068), each weighed down with barbaric gold and pearl, with Christ standing between them with a hand on the head of each.<sup>f</sup> Or a Bulgarian prince stands in the centre with Christ on one side, and a sainted scribe on the other, the scribe being far more occupied with the royal than with the divine presence.<sup>g</sup> Or the subject under a pious monarch is treated as condescendingly as the dogma admitted, the Creator being elevated at all events above the creature. This is seen in a grand miniature in the before-mentioned Bamberg MS. at Munich, where the Lord, in an aureole above, rests his feet on the shoulders of Henry II. of Germany, and places the crown on his head. At the same time an angel is putting a spear, terminating with a crucifix, into his right hand, and another angel a sword into his left, while two saints, kneeling to the monarch, support his burdened arms. Thus the whole investiture goes on at once—divine right, absolute power, and holiest earthly counsels. A later representation of a stronger prince banishes all this circumstance. Roger II., of Sicily (died 1134), as if invoking no dogma of divine right, stands alone, already invested and crowned by his own strong right arm; but above appears the hand of Christ, consecrating his dignity.<sup>h</sup>—*The Quarterly Review*, July, 1864.

<sup>f</sup> Ivory Bibliothèque Impériale, Paris.

<sup>g</sup> D'Agincourt, *Pittura*, tab. 61.

<sup>h</sup> Gally Knight's *Norman Remains in Sicily*.













